Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/modernphilology06chicuoft

(64)

096

409

A 7858

MODERN PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY
JOHN M. MANLY, *Managing Editor*
KARL PIETSCH — STARR W. CUTTING — FREDERIC I. CARPENTER
T. A. JENKINS — FRANCIS A. WOOD — JEFFERSON B. FLETCHER

ADVISORY BOARD
JAMES W. BRIGHT — FRANCIS B. GUMMERE
GEORGE HEMPL — GEORGE L. KITTREDGE
JOHN E. MATZKE — CALVIN THOMAS
FREDERICK M. WARREN

VOLUME SIX

1908–1909

99338
3/11/09

CHICAGO
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
1909

PB
1
M7
v.6

Published
July 1908, October 1908
January 1909, April 1909

Composed and Printed By
The University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois, U. S. A.

CONTENTS

Editorial Note 1

PHILIP S. ALLEN. Mediaeval Latin Lyrics. Part II 3

EDWARD C. ARMSTRONG. The French Past Definite, Imperfect, and Past Indefinite 45

WILLIAM H. CARPENTER. Dutch Contributions to the Vocabulary of English in America 53

LUCY M. GAY. On the Language of Christine de Pisan 69

I. C. LE COMPTE. Guiraut Riquier and the Viscount of Narbonne . 97

C. R. BASKERVILL. Some Parallels to *Bartholomew Fair* . . . 109

WILLIAM H. HULME. A Probable Source for Some of the Lore of Fitzherbert's *Book of Husbandry* 129

FRANKLIN B. SNYDER. A Note on *Sir Thopas* 133

PHILIP S. ALLEN. Mediaeval Latin Lyrics. Part III 137

EDWARD B. REED. Two Notes on Addison 181

R. E. N. DODGE. The Well of Life and the Tree of Life 191

ALBERT S. COOK. *Pearl* 212 ff. 197

KARL YOUNG. A Contribution to the History of Liturgical Drama at Rouen 201

CHARLES GOETTSCH. Ablaut-Relations in the Weak Verb in Gothic, Old High German, and Middle High German. Part II 229

C. R. BASKERVILL. The Sources of Jonson's *Masque of Christmas* and *Love's Welcome at Welbeck* 257

J. J. JUSSERAND. *Piers Plowman*, the Work of One or of Five . . 271

LOUISE B. MORGAN. The Source of the Fountain-Story in *Ywain* . . 331

VIRGINIA C. GILDERSLEEVE. Brynhild in Legend and Literature . . 343

C. M. LOTSPEICH. Musical Accent and Double Alliteration in the *Edda* 375

PHILIP S. ALLEN. Mediaeval Latin Lyrics. Part IV 385

J. PRESTON HOSKINS. Biological Analogy in Literary Criticism. Part I. Variation and Personality 407

GEORGE L. KITTREDGE. Chaucer's Alceste 435

GEORGE L. HAMILTON. Concerning Fitzherbert's *Book of Husbandry* . 440

FRANCIS A. WOOD. Studies in Germanic Strong Verbs. Part III . . 441
EDWARD B. REED. The College Element in *Hamlet* 453
ALBERT S. COOK. Six Notes 469
F. L. CRITCHLOW. Arthur in Old French Poetry not of the Breton Cycle 477
LOUISE F. PEIRCE. A Guide for the Blind 487
A. A. KERN. Deschamp's "Thuireval" 503
J. H. HEINZELMAN. Eichendorff and the Volkslied 511
ALBERT H. TOLMAN. Alternation in the Staging of Shakespeare's Plays 517

Modern Philology

VOL. VI *July, 1908* No. 1

EDITORIAL NOTE

It is with great regret that we announce that Mr. Allen has felt himself obliged by the demands of other duties to retire from the position of managing editor of *Modern Philology*. As is doubtless well known to most of our readers the establishment of the journal was due to his energy and enthusiasm, and during the five years of its history he has borne by far the largest part of the labor and responsibility connected with it. No one who has read the five volumes produced under Mr. Allen's supervision can, we believe, fail to recognize and be grateful for the high standard of scholarship which has been maintained in them and the eagerness with which good work has been welcomed from every quarter.

This fine achievement has been made possible for him and his coeditors by the hearty co-operation of the contributors and by the constant and ungrudging assistance of the members of the Advisory Board, all of whom will surely join us in the regret that other duties have made it necessary for Mr. Allen to withdraw from the official relation to them and us which has so happily existed for these five years.

It should be added that, before resigning, Mr. Allen had sent to the printer the whole of the contents of the present number and a considerable part of the number for October, thus materially facilitating the task of his successor. For this, as well as for his unremitting devotion to the journal during the past five years, we

wish to record here our gratitude and to express our high appreciation of his services to *Modern Philology* and to the cause of scholarship in our field of work.

In consequence of Mr. Allen's resignation and some previous losses from the staff of editors, it has seemed desirable to add some new members. All of us, old members and new, hope for a continuance of the aid and sympathy given the journal so freely in the past and believe that our hope will not be disappointed. If our contributors will continue to send us their best work, we promise to find space for as much of it as possible. The existence in America of four periodicals devoted to the publication of studies in the field of the modern languages and literatures is a fact of no small moment for the promotion of productive scholarship among us, attended as it has been, not by any lowering of the standards of publication, but rather, we believe, by a constant and steady incitement to more and better work. We shall continue to strive to do our part in providing a means for the publication of some of the best.

MEDIAEVAL LATIN LYRICS

PART II

SPIRIT AND FORM

A fundamental principle which underlies my treatment of mediaeval Latin poetry is that the material should be divided and classified according to the spirit of its content and not according to the manner of its external form. I have been so constantly occupied with this idea that I failed to notice, until my attention was recently directed to the omission by Mr. E. K. Rand, that nowhere have I characterized sharply the current practice which makes the whole corpus of mediaeval Latin lyrics owe its very existence to a progressive amplification of rhythms evolved in connection with ninth- and tenth-century sequences. I hasten to correct this fault and for the sake of convenience begin with two sentences of Wilhelm Meyer's coining which bid fair to carry desolation in their wake:

> In Deutschland wie in Frankreich entwickelte zuerst die durch die Sequenzendichtung veranlasste lyrische Dichtung in lateinischer Sprache sich zu bedeutender Blüte, dann erst begann die Dichtung in französischer und in deutscher Sprache sich ähnlicher Formen zu bedienen. Gaston Paris . . . . nennt diese Herrschaft der lateinischen Dichtung 'funeste;' allein wer kann sagen, ob und wie die französische oder die deutsche Dichtung sich entwickelt hätten, wenn sie das lateinische Vorbild nicht gehabt hätten?[1]

I shall not occupy myself with the question, *how* mediaeval vernacular poetry would have developed if it had not possessed the Latin model. For it did have this model, it did use it, and no finite mind may determine just what would have happened if the opposite had been true. The other query, *would* mediaeval vernacular poetry have developed if the Latin model had not preceded it, seems to me equally futile. I will say, however, that it is an egregious claim to make, even by implication, for Latin

[1] Cf. *Fragmenta burana*, p. 183.

poetry that except for it French and German lyric expression would have come to a standstill.

But a phrase in Meyer's first sentence not only merits, it demands investigation: "lyric poetry in Latin caused by the writing of sequences." This is no chance remark of Meyer's torn from its context for convenient dissection. The statement is made at the close of his well-known article on the rise of mediaeval poetry which accompanies the *Fragmenta burana.*[1] Herein he has portrayed for us the transition from old poetry to new: he tells us the worn story of how about the year 860 a monk came from Jumièges to St. Gall with an antiphonary; how his German brethren thus learned to substitute for the vowel *a* in the alleluia-melodies independent texts; how Notker outstripped all other men in the writing of beautiful sequences; how such creations became popular and strongly developed the personality of poets, giving to their work a new content; lastly, how the composition of sequences freed popular poetry from the classical straitjacket and the sorry rhythmic dress of the Carolingian age, led it back to the well-spring of all poetic beauty, to music, and thus made possible an unhampered and natural evolution of mediaeval poetry *ab ovo*, not Latin poetry alone, but French and German poetry as well.

Winterfeld believed that Meyer inverted the picture; that the sequence did not make use of secular materials, but that the secular poet, with sure instinct for what was lifegiving and enduring in conventional poetry, took possession of the sequence-forms which the church poets had created.[2] I believe this, and I am likewise sure that sequences did not bring about lyric poetry, but that lyric poets developed the sequence. This is, as Winterfeld suggests, no mere battle of words: it concerns vitally our entire conception of the coming-to-be of mediaeval vernacular poetry.

Meyer's contention is that the sequence, a purely practical device which substituted separate syllables for a single vowel, was the bio-germ of mediaeval lyric efflorescence: "plötzlich hörte

[1] "Wie entstand die Blüte der mittelalterlichen Dichtungsformen," *Fragmenta burana*, pp. 166 ff. Cf. also the other two studies on Latin rhythmic poetry, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, Vol. I, pp. 136 ff., Vol. II, pp. 1 ff.

[2] *Herrigs Archiv*, Vol. CXIV, p. 73.

man statt 100 'la' einen schönen Lobgesang." Even if we wish to accept this view, that from a mnemonic system of notation there sprang the beauty of European lyric verse, we can certainly not believe this evolution a mechanical one; the miracle was effected by the genial efforts of a multitude of poets. And their personality was not developed by the sequence, as Meyer says, but their personality gave the sequence-form its material power, its life. And the sequence did not give the work of poets new content, as Meyer says, but the labor of these poets furnished the sequence with themes, motifs, and new content of every sort. For the *form* of poetry does not create the *spirit* of it; the letter of a poem does not beget the meaning of it.

At the risk of seeming trite, I must continue for a moment to say perfectly obvious things. It has been an undesirable result of certain investigations into mediaeval meters and rhythms that we have come to regard the outer garment of a Latin poem as its chief distinguishing factor. We realize that we should not do this, but we do it just the same. It is no accident of exterior garb which makes or unmakes for us the poems of Dante, Shakespeare or Goethe; not *terza rima*, blank verse, or *knüttelvers*, but the spirit and content of their thought. Why should it be different with the Latin poets of the Middle Ages?

This does not mean, of course, that it is not important for us to miss no word of the penetrating studies in which Wilhelm Meyer seeks and masters the secret of many mediaeval Latin poetic forms; he teaches us rightly that here and not "with Bartsch in the forests of the old Celts and Germans" are we to find certain of the formulae which Provençal, French, and German epic and lyric used at a later time, less widely, and with less artistic effectiveness.[1] How these forms grew in complexity and effectiveness Meyer shows us, until all the varied store was there which the mediaeval Latin lyric used, oftentimes with such seeming ease.

But never once was it the *form* of Latin rhythmic diction which was responsible for the full sheaves of story, drama, or lyric. It was the German spirit of artists like Notker and Ros-

[1] Cf. *Fragmenta burana*, p. 170.

witha and Ekkehard and the author of *Ruodlieb* which dominated the imperfect Latin diction of their age and created a renaissance despite it, just as surely as it was a similar German spirit two centuries later that made use of a wealth of musical rhythms to set its sentimental lyric singing in, or to set into its dramas.

Throughout the foregoing study I have done what I could to separate different types of song. This can be done but rarely, and then with much hazard, from the standpoint of external form. If we judge by form alone, many of the examples I have already had occasion to cite, would be demonstrably of learned and clerical origin. For music and culture and the ability to find expression for mother-wit in poetic speech were for centuries *so far as we know* indissolubly connected with the cloister and the school, and without these institutions none knows what rhythms we might have possessed. It is Wilhelm Meyer's question over again: What would have happened, if things had happened differently?

As an illustration let us take the *Levis exsurgit zephyrus* quoted in full above. The spirit of this poem is "popular," by which I mean at this point unlearned, not resting upon classical or clerical tradition, the picture of real experience, told in terms of such simple nature-parallelism as folk-song uses. But how about the form of it? Did the author invent the meter, or did it derive directly from a church hymn? Presumably the latter, I should say. But even then we are little wiser than before. We do not know that cloister music did not as frequently refresh itself at the fountain-head of popular melody (*volksweise*)[1] as cloister poetry found similar renewal in popular poetry. We only know that such music has not descended to us from a certain time except in clerical redaction. Again, cloister music might well have made

[1] Church hymns and pious songs have been set to the music and the meters of profane and popular poetry ever since St. Jerome lived at Bethlehem, at least. From that day to this we have hundreds of recorded instances in which a popular metrical form or a secular tune has furnished the model for ecclesiastical song. Almost every renaissance of clerical poetry has derived a notable part of its inspiration and its strength from secular music. When we know that *My Jesus, as Thou wilt* is sung to the aria from *Der Freischütz*, or that *Guide me, O Thou great Jehovah* is fitted to the waltz-song from *Martha*, and remember that such has been the case among different peoples at many various times, why should we believe otherwise regarding tenth-century melodies? I do not think a bibliography at this juncture designed to show the occasional priority of popular musical forms would have any particular point as it would necessarily concern itself chiefly with other periods than the one we are considering and could therefore prove nothing circumstantially.

popular texts too difficult for general singing, just as music of a more popular sort has often given wide currency to a text which otherwise would have found small acceptance. Music has ever acted either as hindrance or solvent. Again, if we eliminate from this minstrel's song the unknown element of music, and deal with the cadence of the lines themselves, we are not sure how these should be enunciated. My own guess would be a measure of four stresses, not unlike that which Hildebrand so conveniently discovered could be imposed on most Germanic lyric verses. But this is a guess, and those may arise who find in this simple song deliberate if unsuccessful trial of quantitative stanzas.

As a matter of fact, who "invents" meters? Many poets first and last, no doubt, just as many composers invent musical settings for moods and words. But in the case of any one humble poet it is difficult to decide what is the source of a particular rhythmic expression; and the last to know the truth would often be the poet himself. Even if the *Levis exsurgit* be identical in structure with a hundred hymns of the time, we should not need to believe it secondary or imitative. We could not rightly say that "the church hymn had at the close of the tenth century won over profane song." We could merely state that certain rhythms of unknown origin were considered during this age so attractive and adequate that they clothed themes of both sacred and secular intent. Simple rhythms of whatever origin must be possessed of dormant popularity; if we learn through MSS that they were widely disseminated, then we know this popularity was actually achieved; otherwise, because of the lack of ocular evidence, we are forced to suspend judgment.

I wonder if it will be felt that the further classification of the mediaeval Latin lyric which I attempt in the following pages is vexatious. Such febrile insistence is sometimes made on apparently unessential facts that the lay-reader cannot be blamed for his suspicion that microscopic analysis of literary forms is altogether unnecessary. Were Lowell alive today he might well write an essay for which the world is waiting: "On a certain habit of hair-splitting prevalent in higher schools."

Still, difficult as it is to be sane and moderate in one's classifi-

cation, it is many times as hard not to classify. Skeptical though I am of the justice of many, nay, of most, of Jeanroy's divisions of the mediaeval French lyric,[1] it is by reason of them and of the appreciative comment necessary to uphold them that we have the best book yet written on an important subject. On the other hand, Ronca's essay on the mediaeval Latin lyric,[2] equipped though it is with all the apparatus of scholarship, miscarries just because it fails to distinguish clearly the various kinds of poetry he is treating.

This I must pause to prove, not only because Ronca's work has gained among students a high and not undeserved reputation, but because I can thus justify the divisions set forth in the following pages. After much investigation of Ronca's statements I believe it is fair to say that every generalization he makes regarding the mediaeval Latin lyric is blurred, since it is inapplicable to a part of the material he is considering. In his zeal to establish the fact that goliardic verse existed long before the twelfth century he sets aside the differences which mark off school-poems, songs of the wandering students, and popular balladry in Latin garb, and heaps them all together in a single hill. Thus in one place[3] we find the following odd assemblage of verses grouped as "canzoni amorose": *O admirabile Veneris idolum*, *Jam dulcis amica venito*, the one hundred and fifty leonine distichs from Ivrea, the Latin *alba* with Provençal refrain, the three rather stupid metrical poems published by Hagen, no one of which by any possible twist of the fancy may be denominated a song.[4] The first four of these poems I have

[1] As a pendant to this study I have already announced the essay on the Merovingian mime. The materials for this are now in hand, but their publication must await the appearance of Mr. Manly's third volume of the *Specimens of the Pre-Shakespearian Drama;* for my whole idea of early minstrelsy is so colored by the basic view I have learned from him that without it my projected study would be lean indeed.

The sequel to the present study, however, will be a chapter on the mediaeval French lyric; and I shall not be deterred from writing this because of the prevalent notion that Jeanroy's *Origines* is definitive for this field. Jeanroy's statement of facts is not consonant with the situation as I am compelled to see it, and certain problems which are to me inevitable he frankly avoids. I wish to invade the domain of French lyric, foreign though it is to the conventional routine of my academic labor, in order further to prepare the groundwork for a volume on the history of the mediaeval lyric in Europe.

[2] "Principali elementi e caratteri della cultura e poesia latina del medio evo" (pp. 25–202 of Ronca's *Cultura medievale e poesia latina in Italia nei secoli xi e xii*).

[3] *Op. cit.*, pp. 159, 160.

[4] Cf. Hagen, *Carmina medii aevi*, pp. 190, 194, 206. Not the content alone, but the spirit of the content, determines the lyricality of a poem. Ronca would doubtless group with the

treated elsewhere and may besides assume to be familiar to the reader. But the three from Hagen require a passing glance, that we may realize how unlyric their spirit is.

The first, which Ronca terms "a love-poem of the tenth century"[1] is entitled *Versus ad juvenem et puellam affectuosius se invicem intuentes*, and is couched in elegiac distichs. It begins:

Occurrunt blando sibi lumina vestra favore
Et voto arrident intima corda pari.
Alterno facies sibi dant responsa rubore
Et tener affectum prodit utrimque pudor.

Where this prosaic thing originated, it is impossible to say, but the type is clear: it belongs to the endless array of practice-exercises that we meet with in the *artes dictamini*. The second piece, which Ronca calls "another absolutely obscene poem from the same codex,"[2] handles an artificial situation of like sort—it is a development of the theme of nun and clerk. Proof that the poem is nothing more than a dull school-task is furnished by the superscription.[3]

Ronca's third citation, which he says is a "spring-poem before the eleventh century,"[1] is the *De innovatione vernali*. No school subject received more stereotyped treatment than just this one, and a dozen more pleasing examples than this which Ronca summons forth from oblivion might easily be found. I give a number of lines to show how bad it is:

Quicquid hiems tamquam veteri deforme senecta
Absque decore diu fecerat esse suo,
Ver novat atque novo compubescentia flore
Imperat ad teneros cuncta redire dies.
Rupta videbantur antiqui foedera nexus
Convulsusque odiis cedere sanctus amor.
Visa elementorum communio sacra revelli
Et fetus eadem velle orare suos,

drinking-song which deals with the abbot of Angers (cf. Part I, p. 45) the twelve "carmina potatoria" of the tenth century printed in *Poetae latini medii aevi*, Vol. IV, pp. 350 ff. (cf. Dümmler, *Neues Archiv*, Vol. X, pp. 347 ff.). But these pieces are inept and stupid in both manner and tone, eleven of them being but short invocations to feast-days and saints' days. They are thoroughly without lyric appeal and therefore beyond the pale of our discussion.

[1] Why, I do not know; the MS in which it is found is Cod. Bern. 568 saec. XII.

[2] Why, I do not know; the MS in which it is found is Cod. Bern. 434 saec. XV.

[3] Above the piece is written: Quedam monacha nigris vestibus induta diligens quemdam clericum volens quod ageret rem cum ea: at ille nolens se consentire peccato se realiter hiis versibus excusavit.

In veteremque pari conversa furore tumultum
Invisam rebus accelerare necem.
Autumnus senior gelide post credita spectans
Semina crediderat fenus obisse suum.

I contend that such indiscriminate grouping of Latin verses as we have here found Ronca guilty of is not helpful. Nowhere in his long essay does Ronca trouble to separate the jewels of poetry from the ashes and cinders which hide them. Like Hubatsch he becomes involved in frequent contradiction because of failure to establish classes. We shall meet a like fate, unless what follows convinces the reader that to apprehend the real nature of Latin song in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries he must recognize at least three types: (1) *nugae amatoriae;* (2) *goliard lyrics;* (3) *popularizing lyrics.*

NUGAE AMATORIAE

If the light and popular ballads of love and springtime which we are now to examine owe their origin to scholastic and churchly tradition, then they were born in France. For in no other land of mediaeval Europe do we find this tradition by half so brilliant and strong. At no time during the ninth and tenth centuries was the culture inaugurated by Charles the Great entirely wanting — here and there in Germany and France we find isolated instances of its survival. But still these centuries were largely a period of social disorganization unfavorable to consistent poetic effort,[1] and the new humanism of the twelfth century does not derive its impulse directly from them. It is rather coeval with the sudden rise of the schools and of scientific studies which is so marked a characteristic of the latter half of the eleventh century in France. We read the truth of this somewhat in Latin poetry.[2]

[1] Cf. Maître, *Les écoles épiscopales et monastiques* (1866), p. 96; Milman, *History of Latin Christianity* (1867), Vol. III, p. 329; Mullinger, *The Schools of Charles the Great* (1877), pp. 137 *et al.*; *History of the University of Cambridge* (1873), Vol. I, pp. 45 f.; Bartoli, *I precursori del rinascimento* (1877), p. 18; Newman's essays "The Reformation of the Eleventh Century" (*British Critic* [1841], April), and "The Benedictine Centuries" (*The Atlantis* [1859], January); Giesebrecht, *Geschichte d. deut. Kaiserzeit*, Vol. I (1881)[5], p. 329; Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*, Vol. I (1904)[7], pp. 350 ff.; Sandys, *op. cit.*, chaps. xxv and xxvi.

[2] If we consider the poems, say, of Abbo of St. Germain (d. 923), Walafrid Strabo (d. 849), Eugenius Vulgarius (*ca.* 928), Notker the Stammerer (d. 911), Froumund of Tegernsee (*ca.* 1013), Wipo (d. 1051), Hermann Contractus (d. 1054), Ekkehard IV (d. *ca.* 1060), we find that they are filled with far-fetched figures and tropes, with words that must have been intelligible to only a highly cultured audience; at every turn they show a slavish imitation of

A double reason accounts for the lack of clarity and naturalness in the earlier mediaeval Latin school-poems. First, there would be at any time before the wider dissemination of education but few men who could attain the stylistic ease of Gerbert of Rheims and Lambert of Hersfeld, to say nothing of the mastery of John of Salisbury and Abelard.[1] Secondly, in the ninth and tenth centuries, as in the sixth, there was an attempt to achieve a *dolce stil nuovo;* simplicity and correctness were taboo, bombast and abnormality were striven for.[2] In a phrase, we discover a wordy rhetoric where we had hoped for poetry.[3]

classical form and diction, or a blind adherence to other clerical models. Now it is true that a German spirit, a sort of inner warmth, occasionally glimmers in the Latin verses of Wipo and Hermann (cf. Dümmler "Opusculum Herimanni diverso metro conpositum," *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XIII, p. 433); true that Ekkehard IV's attractive *Casus S. Galli* has thrown such a charm about the life of an early mediaeval monastery that scholars have vied with one another in portraying in living colors the inmates as gifted poets and musicians *sine pari* (Schubinger, *Die Sängerschule St. Gallens* [1858], Winterfeld, *Ilbergs neue Jahrbücher*, Vol. V, pp. 350 ff., likewise "Rhythmen- u. Sequenzenstudien" in *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Gautier, *La poésie liturgique*, etc., etc.). True, of course, above all that the poet of *Waltharius* often discovers the popular German vein, that his namesake knows the *volkslieder* sung in the streets, the proverbs that fall from the lips of the laity (cf. Dümmler, "Ekkehard IV von St. Gallen," *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XIV, pp. 8, 9). It is true that Froumund, although not the author of the *Ruodlieb*, and often limping and obscure (Seiler, *Zeitschr. f. deut. Phil.*, Vol. XIV, p. 405) is yet on occasion tender, humorous, and possessed of an effective native coarseness (Kempf, *Froumund von Tegernsee* [1900], p. 67). And so one might go down the roll, remembering Walafrid and Roswitha, Thietmar and Notker—Notker, who, whether author of the tales of the Monk of St. Gall and all that Winterfeld "instinctively" assigns to him, or not (Wattenbach, *Geschichtsschreiber d. deut. Vorzeit*, Vol. XXVI [1890][3], Kögel, *Litteraturgesch.*, Vol. I, Pt. 2, p. 221, Baldauf, *Der Mönch von St. Gallen* [1903], Winterfeld, *Stilfragen*, p. 11, *Herrigs Archiv*, Vol. CXIV, p. 73) is the unforgettable creator of the sequence, the poet who learned of the lowly minstrel as well as of the MSS of the cloister-school. But, important as all this and all like this is for the story of German life and literature, the form of these Latin school-poems is apt to be crude, unbending, artificial, they are the outcome of toil and not talent, they are so colorless and general (with but few exceptions) as to speak of no particular time or place, often they are so tortuous that we may not even guess as to their intent.

[1] Cf. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa* (1898), Vol. II, pp. 707, 750 ff.; Deutsch, *Peter Abälard* (1883), pp. 62 f.; Sandys, *op. cit.*, pp. 489, 498, 509, 517.

[2] Cf. Gautier, *La poésie religieuse dans les cloîtres des ix-xi siècles* (1887), pp. 33 ff.; Dreves, *Analecta hymnica*, Vol. VII (1889), pp. 10 ff.; Roger, *L'enseignement des lettres classiques*, pp. 238 ff. Norden (*op. cit.*, p. 754) does not spare the so-called tropes and prosae of the tenth and eleventh centuries when he says: "They belong to the most hair-raising productions ever composed in the Latin language; fustian and eccentricity celebrate their bacchanalian orgies. The one thing comparable to them are the *Hisperica famina*." Cf. Zimmer, *Nennius vindicatus* (1893), pp. 291 ff.; and on the general matter of cryptic Latin expression, Giesebrecht, *De litterarum studiis apud Italos* (1845), pp. 22 f.; Goetz, "Über Dunkel- und Geheimsprachen," *Sitzungsber. d. sachs. Gesellschaft* (1896), pp. 62 ff. For a convenient survey of Latin literature in the tenth and eleventh centuries cf. Sandys, *op. cit.*, chaps. xxvi, xxvii.

[3] Ecclesiastics and schoolmen had, of course, no such conception of the mission of poetry as prevailed in a later age. Verses and letters were written to gain fluency of expression in the Latin tongue, to inculcate grammatical principles, to acquire an epistolary

But when the new time appears a comparative freedom of movement is manifest. An awakened consciousness expresses itself in verse which speaks of the world about it; the poet has ceased in some measure to be the artisan, he is more the artist. He is concerned with the portrayal of personal thought and experience, his literary traditions are those of his own day, the content of his work is warmer and more subjective, the pressure of the age molds his material into new forms. An individuality confronts us, and not a monk.[1]

And so it is that we now meet with a more iridescent poetic language; one that is still at times forced or even vitiated, but yet succinct and striking, one that is by turn solemn and passionate, simple and wanton, joyous and abandoned.[2] Poets begin to believe

style, etc. The so-called *dictamina* were decked out with every sort of pompous quirl and flourish (cf. Zarncke, *Sitzungsber. d. sächs. Gesellschaft* [1871], pp. 34 ff.; Wattenbach, *Archiv f. österr. Geschichte*, Vol. XIV, pp. 854 ff.; *Sitzungsber. d. bayr. Akademie* [1872], pp. 594 ff.; *Berliner Akademie* [1892], pp. 91 ff.; Rockinger, *Quellen u. Erörterungen*, Vol. IX [1863]; Mari, *I trattati medievali di ritmica latina* [1899]; Norden, *op. cit.*, pp 953 ff.). Likewise Latin verse-making either had a purely practical aim or was but a sort of play in academic metrics. Content mattered little, formula was all. A flowery diction was attempted, verses were overloaded with scholastic erudition till they staggered and fell, and even in the slightest structures, such as epitaphs and inscriptions, we constantly meet most unlikely quotations from the *Aeneid*, the *Metamorphoses*, and the *Ars amandi* (Steinmann, *Die tituli und die kirchliche Wandmalerei* [1892]; Dresdner, *Kultur- u. Sittengesch. d. ital. Geistlichkeit*, pp. 202 ff.). Dresdner says: "Despite the constant manufacture of verses these centuries are wretchedly poor in poetry as few others have been." For an outline sketch of transitional Latin poetry cf. Norden, "Die latein. Lit. im Übergang vom Altertum zum Mittelalter," *Kultur der Gegenwart*, Part I, division viii (1905), pp. 374–411; Gröber, *Grundriss*, Vol. II, p. 323; Wattenbach, *Sitzungsber. d. Berliner Akad.* (1891), p. 97; Langlois, *Notices et extraits*, Vols. XXXIV and XXXV; Mari, *Roman. Forschungen*, Vol. XIII, pp. 883 ff.

[1] Cf. Gröber, *Grundriss*, Vol. II, p. 323.

[2] Cf. Gröber, *Grundriss*, p. 324. Seiler in his review of Voigt's *Kleinere lateinische Denkmäler der Tiersage* (*Anzeiger f. d. Alt.*, Vol. V [1879], p. 102) rightly considers the animal tales and fables of high importance for the history of mediaeval intellectual life. He says: "These poems show the seeds of a thoroughly new spirit. Elsewhere in the twelfth century we find, it is true, enthusiastic religious ardor, the simple and credulous narrative of sacred story, an earnest and punitive morality; but in our poems there is no word of all this. In its place there appears an insistence on the right of subjective appetites and views which is quite unheard of in this time: whatever is pleasing is permitted. An ironic portrayal of self forms the innermost kernel of these verses and despite the rhetorical art and artifice which fills them there sometimes peer forth from such witty and coruscating lines the well-known features of Sir John Falstaff ironed into a smooth but unfelt solemnity. It is the same spirit which breathes yet more boldly and boisterously in the songs of the wandering students." Longer pieces which betray the like penchant for didactic allegory and satire parallel these shorter efforts: cf., for example, the *sermones* of Amarcius (*ca.* 1046), the *Speculum stultorum* of Nigel Wireker (*ca.* 1190), and the *Architrenius* of Jean de Hauteville (*ca.* 1181); Francke, *Amer. Jour. Phil.*, Vol. XI (1890). For Juvenal in the Middle Ages, cf. *Anz. f. Kunde d. d. Vorzeit* (1871), p. 232: *magis credunt Juvenali quam doctrinae prophetali*, the bibliography cited by Sandys, *History of Classical Scholarship* (1903), pp. 619 f., and Hild, *Bulletin mensuel de la faculté des lettres de Poitiers* (1890 f.).

themselves the favorites of the muses; they are convinced of immortality.[1] Gröber is doubtless right in believing that this enlightenment first came in the northwestern provinces of France — in the ecclesiastical domain of Tours — and spread soon thereafter to Normandy, England, and Germany. The Provençal lyric felt the breath of it, and a quickened pulse beats in the work of French and Anglo-Norman poets like those already mentioned in an earlier chapter on the goliards, like Hugo of Orleans and Baudri of Bourgueil, and others too numerous to mention. Suddenly the almost emptied lists are thronged by a newly marshaled legion of poets whose very number bespeaks strength.[2]

The transition from such poetry as this to twelfth-century love-songs of MSS like Cambridge and St. Omer, Queen Christine and Benedictbeuern, would now seem easy, in a sense inevitable. The mystery attending on the dawning of Latin *minnesang*, like that of German love-poetry some fifty years later would now appear to be explained away. We have but to wait a little while and this Franco-Latin poetry just described will have crossed the German borders with the student and clerk who is retracing his homeward steps;[3] and no German clerk of the day was considered sufficiently cultured without a training at the French schools. We need therefore not be surprised to find this poetry a little later serving the uses of lighter Latin verses which are Teutonic in feeling and in imagery, and even pointing the way to a subsequent body of vernacular verse. And thus we might travel blithely from Abelard's school on Mont Ste. Génevieve via Bavarian-Latin poets like the authors of certain poems in the *Carmina burana* straight to the lyrics of Walther von der Vogelweide. Why not? Literary history has had to chronicle stranger journeys. And we might nod our heads in sleepy acceptance of this *empfindsame reise* except for one thing:

[1] Peter of Blois is a child of his age when he says: "Nostra etiam scripta quae se diffundunt et publicant circumquaque, nec inundatio, nec incendium, nec ruina, nec multiplex saeculorum excursus poterit abolere."

[2] Confronted by these facts Gebhart (*Les origines de la renaissance de l'Italie*, 1879) asks plaintively: "Why was Italy and not North France the cradle of the Renaissance?"

[3] "Vom Rheine her," said Scherer (*Gesch. d. d. Dichtung*, p. vii), "wirken französische Einflüsse auf Geistliche, Spielleute und Ritter. Sie dringen langsam die Donau hinunter: zuerst französische Theologie; dann französische Epik; zuletzt französische Lyrik."

When we ask, with Reinmar of Brennenburg: "Wâ sint nu alle die von minnen sungen?" the answer is: "So far as we may learn, *no known Latin poet of the twelfth century ever wrote a love-song.*" In this matter Venantius Fortunatus and Alcuin, Walafrid Strabo and Paul the Deacon, Æthelwulf and Theodulus are as much responsible for our Bavarian love-songs written in Latin as are any of the northern French poets who participated in the twelfth-century revival of learning. Let us see.

Adam of St. Victor wrote no profane lyrics; he remained all his life single to the sacred muse. Hildebert of Tours was doubtless the best-known poet of his time, but in all his *carmina miscellanea* there is no erotic lyric verse. He possessed coolness, elegance, and poise. His were a fatal surety of diction and flexibility of form; and yet the best of his odes, like those to the Countess Adèle of Blois and Queen Mathilde, are types of eulogistic writing without the direct and personal plea. They represent but the farthest reach of *stammbuchspoesie.*[1]

Then there is the story of how Bernard of Clairvaux was given in his youth to the writing of worldly verses and prankish songs, but we may not read from this that their burden was the passion of love. Berengar who is sponsor for the tale refers to them as "tilts of rhythmic poetry, *tours de force* of malice and raillery."[2] This is as we should expect.[3] Nor should we imagine that the

[1] Cf. Duperron, *De venerabilis Hildeberti vita et scriptis* (1855); de Deservillers, *Hildebert et son temps* (1873); Dieudonné, *Hildebert de Lavardin* (1898); V. LeClerc, *Histoire littéraire*, Vol. XI², pp. 20 ff.; Hauréau, *Les mélanges poétiques d'Hildebert* (1882). Subjective as Hauréau's criticism often is, it is quite as convincing as that of Pascal ("Le miscellanee poetiche di Ildeberto" (*Poesia latina medievale* [1907], pp. 5–68), who, while he agrees with Colucci (*Un nuovo poema latino dello xi secolo* [1895], pp. 29 f.) that a mediaeval poet should not be censured for occasional lapses from good taste, still adjudges Hildebert no better an artist than Marbod, Gerald of Barri, Matthew of Vendome, and others.

[2] Hauréau would reason that such poems were in part at least love-songs (*Poèmes attribués à S. Bernard*, p. iii). He cites the decree forbidding Cistercians to write rhythmic verses: "monachi qui rythmos fecerint ad domos alienas emittantur, non reversuri nisi per capitulum generale," and remarks: "By reading some collection of these verses, as, e. g., that of the monks of Benedictbeuern, one readily understands how it one day became necessary to condemn so great license, after it had been tolerated so long." The facts do not warrant this statement. First, the Benedictine monks composed few, if any, of the songs in their MS; second, how can one argue from Cistercian and Clunian monks in twelfth-century France to Benedictines of thirteenth-century Bavaria, especially when the first term of the comparison is so vague a factor?

[3] For many passages in Bernard's letters evidence his aptitude for keen satire, and one at least shows him cognizant of the Golias songs. Walter Mapes in his *De nugis curialium* speaks of the epistle which says: "Peter Abelard stalks ahead like full-armored Goliath

moduli of Walter of Chatillon "which resounded through all France" were tender love-songs. Again as in the case of Bernard a biographer tells us that Walter "conposuit cantilenas musicas."[1] And Schreiber, following a hint of Giesebrecht's, assigns to him certain of the St. Omer songs because of their correspondence in diction and manner with some passages of Walter's longer and more earnest satirical narratives. But before we agree to this we must remember that in the Middle Ages musical songs were apt to be anything rather than amatory lyrics, that verbal correspondence by no means indicates borrowing from a particular author in a time and in a medium where set phrases necessarily predominate.[2]

I have chosen the four poets Adam and Hildebert, Bernard and Walter, because they are considered to be the greatest Latin poets of the twelfth century whose names we know. But I have also examined the poetical writings of many others, such as Serlo[3]

before his squire Arnold of Brescia." Cf. *S. Bernardi opera* (1726), Vol. II, col. 183; Phillips, *Walter Map* (*Wiener Sitzungsber.*, Vol. X [1853], p. 333—reprint, p. 17).

[1] Cf. *supra*, Part I, p. 23, n. 2.

[2] There is no good reason for assigning all the St. Omer songs (*Archiv. f. Kunde d. d. Vorzeit*, Vol. VII) to a single author, just because some of them are similar in diction. Nor need we believe the learned professor and author of the *Alexandreis* wrote them, even if they do here and there bear a certain likeness of phrasing to the *Confessio Goliae* and to other poems thought by some to be the work of Walter (cf. Hauréau, *Notices et extraits*, Vol. VI [1893], pp. 292 ff.). The St. Omer songs are none of them simple as some of the *Carmina burana* are; one and all they display the culture and taste of school-products. They therefore show in large measure, exactly as we should expect them to, the same technique and in places almost identically the verbiage of the greater narrative and satirical poems of the goliards. It is at first, I admit, confusing to discover so many coincidences of thought and expression among the more artificial verses of mediaeval schoolmen and wandering students. But the commonplaces which Schreiber industriously cites (*Die Vagantenstrophe*, pp. 23 f., 35 f.) are not necessarily proof of identity of authorship, if we recall that in such poetry the canons of scholastic taste produced an astonishing uniformity. Tricks of speech, conventional imagery, a fixed figurative mold, similarity of view-point, tone, and melody, scarcity of adequate metrical models—all these causes induced a monotony of expression that would be inexplicable, but that we know it was the direct outgrowth of school routine and plagiarism. Again and again mediaeval sermons, letters, poems, nay, whole books, have been accredited to one schoolman or another on the basis of style and diction, only to discover at the last that what had seemed to be a safe foundation for such ascription is naught but quicksand. Many a deft line of Hildebert's is in the *Anthologia latina*, many a dramatic sermon which seems to breathe the very life of Paris is the death-mask of Seneca. Why try to specify what all students know? But, on the other hand, why base arguments on this or that supposed passage of Walter when the next moment may show it to be derived from Lucan?

[3] Before his conversion Serlo was the author of many licentious verses, some of which are known to us (cf. Hauréau, *Notices et extraits*, Vol. I [1890], pp. 313, 323), but interesting as he is as a commentary on the school life of his day, there is nothing in his metrical verses devoted (cf. *Mémoires de l'Académie des inscriptions*, Vol. XXVIII, Part II, p. 242) to the praise of one maiden and one embrace, or to the tale of how his love prefers one deed to many words, which leads us even dimly to suspect this master of arts of a musical song.

of Wilton, Gerald[1] of Barri, Baudri[2] of Bourgueil, Peter[3] of Blois, Reginald[4] of Canterbury, Henry[5] of Huntingdon, and many other poets who have been fabled to write *cantilenae* of the popular and singable sort.[6] Besides this, I have searched through metrical

[1] If Gerald really wrote poetry more lyrical in quality than the *Descriptio cujusdam puellae* (cf. Part I, p. 34, n. 1) or the distichs in which he pleads with Reason to aid him in overcoming his desire for the maiden he surprises at her bath, it is lost to us. This is not likely, for Gerald himself, anticipating the judgment of posterity, collected all his letters, poems, and speeches into one book, not even neglecting to write an autobiography (*Giraldi opera*, ed. Brewer, 1861 f.). No attempt at sincerity characterizes his verses; in epigrammatic measures he toys with any and every theme—whether it be the girl Laetitia or the wrong employment of *utraque*.

[2] No rhythmic songs ascribed to Baudri are extant, but his epistle to Emma (No. 215) is a new proof of the success with which certain churchmen cultivated Latin poetry toward the end of the twelfth century. It gives us a riant picture of the landscape of Bourgueil:

Attamen iste locus foret olim vatibus aptus,
Dum musae silvas solivagae colerent.
Nam prope prata virent, illimibus humida rivis,
Prataque graminea flore fovent oculos.
Et virides herbas lucus vicinus amoenat,
Quem concors avium garrulitas decorat.
Hic me solartur tantummodo Cambio noster,
Cujus saepe undas intueor vitreas.

Romania, Vol. I (1872), p. 45; Delisle, *Mémoires de la société des antiquaires de Normandie*, 3e série, Vol. XXVIII (1871); Pasquier, *Un poète du xie siècle* (1878); Wattenbach, *Berliner Akademie* (1891), p. 16.

[3] So much has been falsely attributed to Peter of Blois that it is not safe often to characterize his writing, but except for a rhythmic conflictus between the flesh and the spirit and a few metrical lines on wine and beer we have nothing left of the poems he refers to in his letters. A single excerpt will suffice (*epistola* lxii): "Quod autem amatoria juventutis et adolescentiae nostrae ludicra postulas ad solatium taediorum, consiliosum non arbitror, cum talia tentationes excitare soleant et fovere. Omissis ergo lascivioribus cantilenis, pauca quae maturiore stylo cecini tibi mitto, si te forte relevent a taedio et aedificent ad salutem." Cf. Du Méril (1847), pp. 151, 201.

[4] Cf. *Neues Archiv*, Vol. XIII (1888); Wright, *Biographia Britannica literaria* (1846), Anglo-Norman Period, p. 78; *Anglo-Latin Satirical Poets* (Rolls Series, 1872), Vol. II, p. 262; ten Brink, *Gesch. d. engl. Lit.* (1899)^2, p. 153. A most charming song is the poem in praise of Reginald's birthplace, Faye-la-Vineuse:

Fagia, si loquerer linguis, et milia nossem
Plectra, prius morerer quam singula scribere possem.
Fagia, dum calidis sol curribus occidet undis
Ceruleae Thetidis, hostes mucrone retundis.
Fagia, donec aper silvas, et flumina piscis,
Et virgulta caper repetent, tu crescere discis.
Fagia, donec apes cithisum, juvenemque puella,
Esuriensque dapes amat, ardes vincere bella.

[5] No amatory verses of Henry's are left us, unless we would call by this name the tender epigrammatic couplets of his younger days like:

Qui tenerorum vulnus amorum non reveretur,
Innumerorum tela dolorum perpetuetur.

Cf. *Anglo-Latin Satirical Poets*, Vol. II, pp. 163 ff.

[6] The light poems of Stephen of Orleans were undoubtedly satirical in strain; cf. *supra*, Part I, p. 23; and Du Méril (1847), p. 151, who gives quotations to prove this point. We need not halt further to extend our list of churchmen who wrote goliardic songs in their unregenerate days, for the tale is ever the same. Odo of Orleans and Godefrid of Rheims were mere *gelegenheitsdichter;* it was satire Pierre of Corbeil composed in his youth; cf. Dreves, *Stimmen aus Maria Laach*, Vol. XLVII (1894), p. 576; Cherest, *Bulletin de la Société des Sciences de l'Yonne*, Vol. VII (1853), p. 35; Chambers, *Mediaeval Stage*, Vol. I, p. 281. The *nugae amatoriae* which Leland ascribes to Joseph of Exeter were doubtless no more lyric than Hildebert's and surely not so graceful.

poems of every kind which might be suspected of containing, or at least suggesting, lyric material: Fulbert of Chartres, Arnulf of Lisieux, Matthew of Vendome, Geoffrey[1] of Vinesauf, Marbod of Rennes, Bernard of Morlaix, etc. Uncharted seas of metrical lines dealing with love and women, the joys of the cup and of gaming, spring landscape and winter sorrow, have also been navigated, for I could not banish the fearful thought that any moment might bring in sight the land where was the sought-for lay of love, even if the poem but dimly shadowed forth the nebulous horizon of it. I shall of course not stop to publish the whole philological log of this journey, for it is only the record of continued disappointment. The colophon of all is: no matter how unsparing the search, there is in the known and unknown Latin school-poems of the twelfth century no simple, rhythmical lay of love.

As to Abelard—I hesitate. His songs in the lighter manner caught, we are told, the ear of the street and the market-place. We have absolutely no proof that they were not written in French instead of Latin, except that a chance utterance of Abelard's informs us that the vernacular jargon was distasteful to him. But suppose that they were in Latin. The statement as to their popularity comes from not unprejudiced sources: either Abelard *loquitur*, and his vanity was not exceeded even by his dialectic dexterity, or it is Heloise that is speaking, with the accustomed ardor of her uniquely passionate temperament. If Heloise is bearing witness of her own personal observation, let us remember that her environment was entirely a clerical and cultured one.[2] So many students had gathered to listen to her master that Rémusat can soberly claim the pupils of Abelard outnumbered the other citizens of a town. They and their camp-followers and parasites were dominated by the brilliant figure of Abelard, blinded

[1] Whose real name seems to have been the cacophonous "de Cumeselz" (cf. Hauréau, *Notices et extraits*, Vol. XXXIV, ii, p. 427; Hamilton, *Amer. Jour. Phil.*, Vol. XXVIII (1907), p. 463.

[2] The story runs that Heloise when standing before the altar at which she took the veil sobbed forth the protest of Lucan's Cornelia (*Pharsalia*, Bk. viii):

o maxime conjux!
O thalamis indigne meis! Cur impia nupsi,
Si miserum factura fui?

Cf. Ronca, *Cultura medievale*, p. 130. Whether we credit this tale or not, it is quite in accord with what we know of the temper of the age.

by his romantic liaison with the mediaeval Hypatia. Very likely they passed his songs from lip to lip like flame. But still there are serious reasons for doubting that these lost *amatoria* would afford us a vision of a new world of erotic lyric singing. For one, I should never seek for them with Ehrenthal among poems like the *Hebet sidus*.[1]

Let us pause a moment to visualize the matter. Suppose that Adam of St. Victor *had* been discovered to be the author of profane love-lyrics, what should we know before we had ever seen them? We should know that one so overfond of displaying feats of skill in versification, of prodigally accumulating and curiously interlacing his rhymes, would never overcome himself and appear a Villon, no matter how perfect his mastery of the forms he used. Or tell us that Hildebert is the author of newly discovered rhythmic pieces on the theme of love, and what shall we anticipate? We shall expect again to meet the classical coolness of an elegant didacticism, the euphuistic statement of an Aramis among churchmen, but not a single melting love-lyric from the gentle prelate who has already filed ten thousand verses smooth. Now if one should say that the composer of a letter to Astrolabius, the author of cut-and-dried *planctus* on Old Testament subjects, the writer of ninety hymns and sequences that breathe but the lifeless excogitations of a theological wit—that some love-songs by this man had just been discovered, who would hurry to their perusal? He who had yawned over sacred pieces that are woefully prosaic in conception and imagery,[2] he who had wondered at the strange contrast such hymns offer to the intense beauty of St. Bernard's? Scarcely.

Three notable Latin poets remain, however: Primate, whom we may now know in part at least as Hugo[3] of Orleans, Archpoet, who

[1] *Studien zu den Liedern der Vaganten* (1891), pp. 5 f.

[2] Wilh. Meyer asserts that Abelard belongs among the most artistic poets of his age, but later on restricts this statement to the forms in which he composed his *planctus* (*Ges. Abhandl.*, Vol. I, pp. 341, 357). Traube likewise speaks of the "formgewandten Abelard" when referring to Dreves' *Hymnarius Paraclitensis* (1891). But it is easy to overestimate the poetic value of the almost numberless additions which twelfth-century churchmen made to hymnals and antiphonaries (cf. Chevalier, *Poésie liturgique* [1893], Julian, *Dictionary of Hymnology* [1892]).

[3] One cannot read without a thrill Wilhelm Meyer's remarkable study of the Primate, Hugo of Orleans (*Göttinger Nachrichten* [1907], pp. 75–111, 113–75). A new poet and a new

should be a German if only for his *meum est propositum*, and scapegrace English Hilary. But still we cannot speak of a tender love-song. In Primate and Archpoet both we find a satire that burns, a humor that riots, a deftness and verve of narration that brings the scene clearly before us with a few bold strokes. And these are things which pave the way for a certain sort of lyric verse, although they never attain to it unless the superadded touch be given. Where among all the pieces of Golias and Archipoeta, Primas and Walter of Chatillon, Walter Mapes[1] and Philip of Grève, do we cull out a love-lyric? The most that can be said of such a lyric in connection with these narratives filled with pungent irony, cynicism, and invective, is that they are at times so personal as to be lyric in their general tone, so genial that we would not willingly deny to the age that bore them a softer accompaniment of love-song. And this existed in fact, as we know, but its authors, like those of popular poetry the world over, are unknown to us.

type of poetry is there discovered to us — we could do without this MS of Oxford verses as little as we could surrender the Cambridge songs or the Benedictbeuern pieces. With masterful touch Meyer unrolls before us the picture of Hugo and his environment. A small, ugly figure — he calls himself Zacchaeus — Hugo is the master of a biting wit, a termagant for temper, but sympathetic with distress, an inveterate beggar, grumbler, gambler; versed in all the lore of the schools and yet a genial poet who knows on occasion how to avoid pedantry and to depict living scenes in a fashion remarkably natural, bluff, and popular. Clearness of expression and an abundance of enlivening detail unite to lend many of his verses a unique warmth and strength. A creature of contrasts: master of smooth hexameters and flawless rhythms, author of mordacious and rough verses mixed of French and Latin; now a conscious poet of elegant diction, now spewing forth nastiness that would shame a gamin of the streets — such Wilhelm Meyer shows him to be, with every shading that combined erudition, acumen, and intuition can disclose. Born toward the end of the eleventh century, some sixty years older than the Archpoet, Hugo does not attain the latter's profundity of thought and emotion; a certain splendor and richness of imagery which characterize the archpoet's efforts are lacking in the Frenchman. But on the other hand there is no trace in Hugo of the learned professor and poet, as in Walter of Chatillon; he is simple and humane as none other of his time.

If such a one as this has left us no lyric love-song of tender import, but contents himself where women are concerned with either a satirical bow or with the railing and bawdy utterance of the brothel, should we dim our eyes seeking through all the amatory pieces of school and church in twelfth-century France for anything more than graceful ode, *gelegenheitslied*, or dedicatory distich? It is labor lost to rummage through a haystack for a needle, unless we believe at least a pin will reward our pains.

[1] "If, as is still possible," says Saintsbury (*History of Criticism* [1900], Vol. I, p. 470, note), "and most probably can never be disproved, Walter Map fashioned the perfect Arthur stories by dint of combining the Lancelot-Guinevere romance and the Graal legend, composed the *De nugis* and *wrote an appreciable quantity of the goliardic poems*, he will run Chaucer hard in all but the claims impossible to his time. But the 'if' is a big if." How large an "if" is made clear by Sandys, who remarks that twelve elegiac Latin verses comprise "almost the only certainly genuine product of Map's muse that has survived;" cf. *Cambridge History of English Literature*, Vol. I (1907), p. 210.

Last not least is Hilary. I find no reason why we should not regard him as the typical *gelegenheitsdichter* of his time in the northern French schools. He was a student of Abelard's, the gift of lyric song as it was understood in his day was strong within him. The phrases of his cult were at his finger-tips. A sense of form rare in the measures of the age characterizes his work, an easy, at times insouciant grace; poetic instinct. He had no aversion to French refrains—Hildebert himself betrays no greater smoothness of rhythm. Until new light is given us we must believe his lines the pattern of the new school-lyric with its Mariolatry made over into *minnedienst*, its conventional rhymed letters to titled blue-stockings,[1] its frank avowal of preferring Ganymede to Hebe. First then let us examine this type of gallant versification, that we may the better appreciate the difference between it and certain ballads of love and springtime found in the *Carmina burana*.

In its inception at least mediaeval Latin school-poetry was satirical rather than lyrical, moralizing rather than descriptive, declamatory and not the expression of individual feeling. Just as it had been the custom in older monastery schools to read long poems treating dully of the viciousness of the world, so at stated intervals when the students of French and English schools assembled for disputation with their teachers we know that poems were presented in which various orders of society and different sects were made to feel the lash of a keen satire. Cynicism soon

[1] Cf. Baudri's epistles to Cecile, Muriel, Agnes, Emma, Beatrix, Constance; Duchesne, *Historiae Francorum scriptores coaetanei*, Vol. IV (1641), pp. 274 ff; Migne, *Patrologia*, Vol. CLXVI, coll. 1181-1208; Delisle, *Romania*, Vol. I (1872), pp. 42 ff. Certain of the twelfth-century *billets doux*, despite the conventional nature of their content, are well worth remembering. I quote from Hagen (*Carmina medii aevi*, p. 201) the tender note to Juliana, by an unknown author:

Carmina missa gravis mihi sunt fomenta caloris:
Totus in accenso pectore saevit amor.
Nuper erat risus mihi missi carminis actor,
Cum Veneris tardam saepe rogaret opem.
Spernebam Venerem, saevosque Cupidinis arcus,
Non expertus adhuc posse, Cupido, tuum,
Indignata Venus zelo me fixit acuto:
Vulneris impatiens sentio, quid sit amor.
Si medicina queat tantum lenire dolorem,
Sola potes dubiae ferre salutis opem.
Mellea verba tuae, nisi fallant dissona, menti
Languenti medicum te, Juliana, dabis.
Tam dulci pretio tibi me firmabis amicum,
Moribus, aetate, nobilitate parem.
Nos ita consimiles, ut mutuus uniat ignis,
Elige me solum, quae mihi sola places,
Et quia nulla domus nostris conspectibus obstat,
Aspectu recrees lumina nostra tuo.

came to the fore at such occasions as William Fitz-Stephen, for example, informs us:[1]

Sunt alii, qui in epigrammatibus rythmis et metris utuntur vetere illa triviali dicacitate, licentia Fescennina socios suppressis nominibus liberius lacerant loedorias jaculantur et scommata, salibus Socraticis sociorum vel forte majorum vitia tangunt vel mordacius dente rodunt Theonino audacibus dithyrambis. Auditores,

multum ridere parati,
Ingeminant tremulos naso crispante cachinnos.

When we remember that even the shorter school-poems were prepared with a view to recitation rather than singing, we find a quick explanation for much of the figurative imagery and scaffolding that the lyric pieces betray. Heaping-up of words, citations of classical analogues by the score, digressive reminiscence of biblical story, far-fetched paronomasia, constant allusion to school-exercises and study—these are the things that find their background in the aula and not in outdoor life.[2]

The Latin erotic lyric, in so far as it was the product of the schools, did not take its origin from these longer songs of learned and cynical import. But it was at first conditioned by the same custom and environment, it sprang from like authors, it leaned on school tradition.

Hilary was a young Englishman[3] who studied with Abelard at

[1] Cf. Wright, *Biographia*, p. 364; Hubatsch, *op. cit.*, p. 20; Robertson, *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket* (1876), Vol. III, p. 1; *Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. XIX, p. 212; Gröber, *Grundriss*, Vol. II, p. 275.

[2] Even the so-called *Comoediae* were written in distichs and intended for reading or at most for reciting; they are as much book-poetry as the legends of Roswitha and are not to be confused with dramas which were performed, like the Mysteries derived from the liturgy, or, on the other hand, the living and political drama of Antichrist. Cf. Cloetta, *Beiträge zur Literaturgesch. d. Mittelalters* (1890), Vol. I; Creizenach, *Geschichte des neueren Dramas* (1893), Vol. I; Chambers, *Mediaeval Stage* (1903), Vol. II, pp. 208 ff.

[3] Duchesne, who first published one of Hilary's songs (*Abaelardi opera*, ed. Amboesus [1616], p. 243*b*), does not deal with his nationality. Mabillon thought him English (*Annales ordinis S. Benedicti*, Vol. V [1713], p. 315); a view adopted in *Histoire littéraire*, Vol. XII (1763), p. 255. Champollion-Figeac hints that Hilary is French (*Hilarii versus et ludi* [1838], p. vii) and Hubatsch agrees with him (*Lat. Vagantenlieder* [1870], p. 10), adding that the grace and smoothness of the poet's diction would have been remarkable in an Englishman of his day(!). Leyser (*Historia poematum* [1741], p. 416) and Gröber (*Grundriss*, pp. 347, 355 f., 396, 421, 424–26) do not refer to the place of his birth, but Wright (*Biographia*, p. 91) and Schofield (*History of Eng. Lit.*, pp. 66, 67) decide for England. Sandys is non-committal. He says that Hilarius "is supposed to have been an Englishman" (*Cambridge History of English Literature*, Vol. I, p. 212).

For English origin speaks the fact that five of Hilary's twelve lyric pieces are addressed to persons of English birth: Eve, Rose, William of Anfonia, and two English boys. Hervey

Paraclet and Quincey. He wrote twelve poems which have come down to us:

1. *Evae virginis epicedium*
2. *Ad sanctimonialem nomine Bonam*
3. *Ad sanctimonialem nomine Superbam*
4. *Forte ad eandem*
5. *Ad Roseam*
6. *Ad Petrum Abelardum*
7. *Ad puerum Andegavensem*
8. *Caliastri laudes*
9. *Ad Guillelmum de Anfonia*
10. *Ad puerum Anglicum*
11. *Ad puerum Anglicum*
12. *De papa scholastico*

The titles of eight of these suffice to indicate the nature of their contents. No. 1 is a flabby and conventional dirge of forty quatrains uninteresting save for the light it throws upon the character of Hilary's scoffing fellows: Eve dwelt alone with the hermit Hervey, asseverates the poet, yet without sin:

Ibi vixit Eva diu cum Herveo socio.
Qui hec audis, ad hanc vocem te turbari sencio.
Fuge, frater, suspicari, nec sit hic suspicio:
Non in mundo, sed in Christo fuit hec dilectio.

Ille sibi serviebat tanquam sue domine,
Et vicissim Eva sibi sub ancille nomine.
Mirus amor viri talis atque talis femine,
Qui probatus et repertus omni sine crimine!

No. 6 is a prayer to Abelard not to retire to Quincey (10 quatrains with French refrain); No. 8 is a potboiler in praise of the charms and the wines of Chalautre, written presumably in

of the *Evae epicedium* is likewise an English recluse. We know that there were many English novices in France at this time; cf. a letter of Geoffrey of Vendome (*Epistolae*, ed. Sirmondo [1610], p. 228; Migne, *Patrologia*, Vol. CLVII) in which he complains that unworthy English clerks have been sent to his monastery. Why deny any of these novices grace and smoothness when they are of the race that is soon to produce the mature work of John of Salisbury, Walter Mapes, and Gerald of Barri? A final reference to the English occurs in a line of the *De papa scholastico:* "Papam tremit Gallus et Anglicus."

The presence of French refrains in two of Hilary's songs has strengthened the opinion of some as to his French origin, but a moment's reflection shows the untrustworthiness of this prop. Macaronic song was the rule and not the exception in a society composed of members from every race in Europe—besides which, since the Norman conquest French was the birthright or the acquirement of all cultured Englishmen. Who can determine the author of the following song:

Scripsi haec carmina in tabulis.
Mon ostel est en mi la vile de Paris:
May y sugge namore, so wel me is;
ȝef y deȝe for love of hire, duel hit ys.

Cf. Wright, *Specimens of Lyric Poetry* (1842), p. 64; ten Brink, *Gesch. d. engl. Lit.* (1899)², Vol. I, p. 354.

payment for food and lodging (9 quatrains); No. 12 is an encomium of the scholastic pope, a figure having to do with one of the scholars' revels. Nos. 7, 9, 10, 11 are odes to boys after the manner of the *O admirabile Veneris idolum*, unworthy of mention except for the scholastic tradition which they mark: a tradition again referred to in No. 12:

> Papa captus hunc vel hanc decipit,
> Papa nullum vel nullam excipit.

We should hardly expect the author of such poems to develop either tenderness or power in addressing women, and in this we are not disappointed. Nos. 2, 3, and 4 are samples of a poetic correspondence Hilary carried on with nuns; he exchanges songs with them, denominates himself their humble servitor, *quem emisti munere*, would have a new girdle from one and bounty from another, and assures them one and all of his unwavering constancy. There is nothing in these three amatory songs, *nugae amatoriae*, to warrant our believing them the models of the sincere, concrete, sensuous popular lyrics contained in the *Carmina burana*. They are simply and solely modish poetry padded with the current polite phrases of *minnedienst*, graceful protestations of an unfelt homage, ready compliments of an *homme du monde*. We could hope for no surer testimony that we must not look to France for the originals of our popularizing lyrics than these twelfth-century Franco-Latin poems. As Hilary's poems are not easily accessible it will perhaps be well to print one of them herewith that the reader may convince himself of the truth of these assertions. I choose his ode to Rose, the warmest, most tender of all his verses:

AD ROSEAM

1

Ave sidus occidentis,
Sidus lucis unice,
Summum decus tue gentis
Et telluris Anglice;
Fama multis argumentis
Protestatur publice
Quis sit status tue mentis,
Quam largus inmodice.

2

Ave, splendor puellarum,
Generosa domina,
Genma micans, sidus clarum,
Speciosa femina,
Quae precellis, et non parum,
Mulierum agmina,
Bonum ingens, bonum rarum,
Mea lege carmina!

3

Crede mihi, cum natura
Te primo conposuit,
Ad probandum sua jura
Te mundo proposuit.
Dotes multas, bona plura
Tibi quidem tribuit;
Et quid posset sua cura
Prudenter exibuit.

4

Te produxit generosam
Parentum nobilitas,
Te produxit speciosam
Benigna nativitas;
Te severam, te jocosam
Doctrine frugalitas;
Nomen tuum signat rosam,
Et ecce virginitas.

5

Per te fama verum dicit
Neque cessat dicere,
Atque famam verum vincit,
Dum nequid sufficere;
Fama vero senper crescit
Neque cessat crescere;
Sic se victam erubescit,
Quae solebat vincere.

6

Corpus decens, splendor visus
Orisque modestia,
Et venustus ille risus
Carensque lascivia,
Effecerunt ut confisus
Sim de tua gratia:
Ob hoc ego sum enisus
Ad audendum talia.

7

Cum sis potens et benigna,
Sicut esse sentio,
Nunc susmito, virgo digna,
Me tuo servitio;
Corpus meum et res meas
Jam tibi subicio;
Me deffendas, et res eas,
Mea sis protectio.

8

Jam securus ego vivam,
Ad cuncta tentamina
Tutus ero, cum te divam
Habeam pro domina.
Sume mea, virgo decens,
Benigne precamina,
Ut te laudet forma recens
Mea senper pagina.

This is as near love-poetry as any known author of the twelfth century came to write. Polished as a brilliant pebble, its phraseology borrowed from the hymns to Mary, addressed to a lady of noble birth, collected and cool as Hildebert's compliment to Adèle or Baudri's epistle to Emma; such poetry was current in the French schools of Hilary's day. Odo of Orleans, Peter of Blois, Godefrid of Rheims, Henry of Huntingdon, and many another may have achieved like verse, but the lost effusions of these young and amorous students have not come down to us.

LOVE-LYRICS OF THE GOLIARDS

We must not call the *nugae amatoriae* of schoolmen and churchmen love-lyrics, for then no term is left to use when we are

confronted by the glowing, sensual, concrete poems with which we are now to deal.[1] In these erotic verses which custom connects with the name of goliard, woman is first depicted with detailed realism, the poet spends himself in the recital of passionate sentiment: "novus ignis in me furit; cor aestuat interius; amare crucior; morior vulnere quo glorior." Hilary's gray-hooded Rose is pale as some young Schiller's Laura when compared with Flora faultless as a blossom,[2] Lydia whose cheeks of rose are dyed with Tyrian red,[3] or the maiden like a morning-star who is compact of Blanchefleur and Helen and full-limbed Venus.[4] In the background of Hilary's poems loom convent walls and nuns singing matins; in goliardic verse the scene shifts to the dimly lighted room of Venus non verecunda:

Dum caupona verterem
Vino debachatus,
Secus templum Veneris
Eram hospitatus;[5]

Veneris ad thalamum
Omnes currunt viae;
Non est in tot turribus
Turris Alethiae;[6]

Si variarum
Odor herbarum

[1] Interesting is the pronouncement of Gerhoh of Reichersberg (d. 1169): "In all the realm of Christendom none longer dares to sing shameless songs publicly." This statement shows how little trust should often be reposed in contemporary testimony. Cf. Scherer, *Gesch. d. d. Dichtung*, p. 63.

[2] *Carmina burana*, No. 56; Wright, *Early Mysteries* (1838), p. 114; Hauréau, *Notices et extraits*, Vol. XXIX, Part II, p. 312. Although the version of MS Christine is the completest of the three redactions (8 stanzas), Hauréau actuated by a false shame prints but three stanzas. In self-justification he quotes Figaro's epigram: "Man drinks when he is not thirsty and makes love continually—that's what distinguishes him from the animals."

[3] *Anthologia latina*, ed. Riese, Vol. II, p. xli; *Gaudeamus* (1879)[2], p. 96.

[4] *Carmina burana*, No. 50; cf. Burckhardt, *Kultur der Renaissance* (1869)[2], p. 138. Two passages of this long mosaic poem are noteworthy: stanzas 8 and 9, which remind in their phraseology of Hilary's *Ad Roseam* but are shot through with color; stanzas 29 and 30, which Symonds refers to as "a paean of victorious passion."

[5] *Carmina burana*, No. 49; a long poem in mock heroic strain dealing with the visit of a student in a brothel.

[6] *Carmina burana*, No. CLXXII; the celebrated *Confessio Goliae.* For the bibliography and variant texts of this poem see Werner, *Beiträge zur Kunde d. latein. Lit.*, p. 200. In the name Alethia Paris (*Romania*, Vol. VII, p. 95; cf. Vol. XXIV, p. 455), Laistner (*Germania*, Vol. XXVI, p. 420; *Golias*, p. 106), and Peiper (*Gaudeamus*[2], p. 213) see an allusion to the character in Theodulus' *Ecloga:* "Alethia virgo decora nimis David de semine regis pro christiana religione decertat cum Pseuste."

Spiraverit,
Si dederit
Thorum rosa,
Dulciter soporis alimonia
Post defessa Veneris commercia
Lassis captatur,
Dum instillatur.[1]

Suddenly it is as if the shackles had fallen away. In such poetry Tannhäuser no longer cringes before the pope hopeless of absolution; Tristan is careless of discovery, Launcelot makes laughing confession. All people seem in love with loving. The world is gross a little, but then for a short space the world is again free. "If you bring Hippolitus | To Pavia Sunday | He'll not be Hippolitus | On the following Monday," says the Archpoet. Stronger than Hercules must that clerk be who but for the moment will escape the snares of Venus.[2] What we may think of this sort of poetry is another matter, but one thing is sure. It is a new type. Where did it come from? How did it come about?

Let me answer these two questions by asking one. Why should the most accomplished and awakened set of writers which central Europe knew—the students at the French schools—be exempt from the pervasive influence of new social ideals which found their highest expression at just this time in vernacular verse and *courtois* poetry? I quote from Diez:

While the songs of the troubadours were affording joy and entertainment to the cultured world in the south of France, the northeast of Spain, and upper Italy, lyrical poetic art was likewise being practiced in the other parts of Europe under the same, or at least similar, conditions and forms and in a kindred spirit. This poetry appears everywhere in the double guise of artistic and courtly verse, developing according to local circumstances and popular traditions. This similarity is even to the casual glance surprising, but it gains in extent and clarity the moment that one after careful sifting collates the various points to be compared. And so the question cannot be avoided: did communication and reciprocal influence occur, and if so, to what extent? In such assembling the Provençal lyric necessarily seems to occupy the most important place, for it

[1] *Carmina burana*, No. 37; of the author of this piece Burckhardt wrote: "der fein beobachtende Sybarit kann kein Nordländer sein."

[2] *Carmina burana*, No. 38; *Analecta hymnica*, Vol. XXI, p. 154: Hauréau says of it (*Notices et extraits*, Vol. XXIX, Part II, p. 310): "C'est une jolie pièce, écrite avec aisance, où la pensée n'est pas obscurcié ni la langue viciée pour satisfaire aux exigences du rythme."

is the oldest and geographically situated in the center of the others. But no matter how many traits these literary phenomena may have in common, one should still be careful not to accord too great weight to their intercommunication. One must at all times seek to differentiate between what is transmitted and, on the other hand, that which arises from general human conditions and from the particular trend of the age.[1]

The poetry of troubadour, trouvère, minnesinger, and goliard are all brought into being by the new spirit of the twelfth century which we know so well; chivalry and the cloth of gold, love of sensuous beauty and of every luxury that spiced and embellished it. None of these bodies of verse grew by insensible gradations out of preceding forms—one single movement added a new character-unit, a simple mutation occurred, and that moment mediaeval worldly love-lyrics of a novel species were born.[2] All that the *nugae amatoriae* of schoolmen needed to become erotic goliard lyrics they received from the same impulse that changed the vernacular lyric of France, Germany, and Italy. The instant this impulse was manifest in Latin poetry the new type was born.[3]

If we wish, then, to connect this storm-and-stress lyric with that of men like Hilary, we must use the phrase school-poetry in a changed sense. It can no longer mean meticulous lyric and epic verse with the traditions of the school and of scholasticism in every line of it. It is a poetry of revolt, one that has found conscious expression for the passions and tumults of town and university life, one that reflects the answer of its time to the pressure of novel conditions.[4] The free-lance who wrote the *Saevit aurae*

[1] Cf. Diez, *Die Poesie der Troubadours* (1883)[2], pp. 213, 215.

[2] Cf. Manly, "Literary Forms and the New Theory of the Origin of Species," *Modern Philology*, Vol. IV, pp. 577 ff.; Allen, *ibid.*, Vol. III, pp. 442 ff.

[3] Vogt, *Leben und Dichten der deutschen Spielleute im Mittelalter* (1876), pp. 9 f.: "Until the middle of the twelfth century the dominant class in the domain of poetry continued to be the clergy, and it is characteristic that even the duchess Gertrude, wife of Henry the Proud, when she wished to hear the Song of Roland in German verses, did not turn as we might expect to a minstrel but to a priest. Not until the twelfth century came, and the whole intellectual life of the nation underwent that powerful about-face which gave full currency to the worldly element in literature, did the minstrels occupy a more important and influential position in the history of German culture." With practically no change these sentences will do as well for the story of any other European literature. As clergy yielded their ground to minstrels, so did Latin churchmen fall back somewhat before the children of this world, the goliards. "Legend and love were the two main themes of the twelfth century literary revolt against earlier religious traditions." Strange, indeed, would it be if the Latin students of the period had continued unmoved by them.

[4] We gain a hint of the coming of such poetry in the Viennese MS published in the *Archiv. f. ältere deutsche Geschichte*, Vol. X, p. 559: "Young people surrender themselves to

spiritus may possibly be a clerk like Hilary, but he resembles him no more than the author of the *Roman Elegies* or the *Venetian Epigrams* resembles the poet who composed watery and inane poetic exercises for the *Leipziger Liederbuch*, or (to speak in terms of closer analogy) than Walther in the years of his maturity as wandering singer and political seer resembled him who wrote while under the spell of Reinmar's courtly effusions the songs of the "first period": theorizing debates on the nature of love.

A new type of poetry assuredly; a new sort of author perhaps. The wandering students (goliards) seem to have known life better than they did grammar and dialectic, to have been in close touch with all classes and conditions of people.[1] They scarcely abandoned their school life to become settled churchmen, famous pedagogues, royal secretaries and the like, as did most of those we spoke of in the preceding chapter. No conventional bonds were set for them; whoever they were, they led a care-free and vagabond

an indiscreet and frivolous manner of living, run after prostitutes who make public display of their wares, and seek by their effeminate and ribald verses to seduce and incite to sensual pleasure any who will listen to them. These youths believe that they are thus acquiring much fame, whereas they only succeed in being ridiculous. For proper and intelligent men despise the things on which they set much value, esteem them as nothing more than minstrels, and take good care not to clothe them with reputable offices." Evil as the morals of the students were, and they have been portrayed to us by many a contemporary reformer (cf., for example, a sermon of Chancellor Prevostin, thirteenth century, Hauréau, Vol. III, p. 166), the pace was set for them by their instructors—like master like man. When we remember the verses of Serlo referred to above, and recall among the poems ascribed to Marbod the *Satira in amatorem pueri* (Migne, *Patrologia*, Vol. CLXXI, col. 1717; Werner, *Beiträge zur Kunde der latein. Lit.*[2], p. 5); when we review the epigrams assigned to Hildebert (Hauréau, *Mélanges poétiques*, pp. 177 ff.): how he believes sodomy not a crime but a vice, details the phases in the development of the human seed, how in the *Elegia de perfida amica* (Gröber, *Grundriss*, Vol. II, p. 421) the poet warns against women who betray their lovers for money; we need not be surprised to find poems of similar import intruding everywhere even in the trope-books and sequence-collections. The song *Clauso chronos reserato* (*Carmina burana*, No. 46) is among a series of Christmas songs in a sequentiar of the Order of Preachers; MS St. Gall 383, *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XXXIX, p. 363, *Analecta hymnica*, Vol. XX, p. 7. The *Olim sudor Herculis* (*Carm. bur.*, No. 38) is found along with other *vagantenlieder* in the antiphonary of Peter of Medici; Codex Laurentianus Plut. XXIX, 1, *Annuaire bulletin de la société de l'histoire de France* (1885), pp. 101 ff., *Analecta hymnica*, Vol. XX, p. 9. The *Rumor letalis* (*Carm. bur.*, No. 83) and other profane songs of the Benedictbeuern collection are included in a troparium of the thirteenth century; Codex Stuttgartiensis. Handbibl. I Asc. 95, *Analecta hymnica*, Vol. XX, p. 28, etc., etc. The famous *chansonnier* of Montpellier contains in parallel columns liturgic texts and erotic, often smutty, French love-songs; Coussemaker, *L'art harmonique au xii et xiii siècle* (1865); Koller, *Zeitschr. f. Musikwissenschaft*, Vol. IV, p. 1-82; Raynaud, *Recueil de motets français* (1881), Vol. I; *Analecta hymnica*, Vol, XX. p. 28. The sacred songs of Cod. Parisin. 15131 appear to have been composed to fit the melodies of old French popular pieces; Hauréau, Vol. IV, p. 278, *Analecta hymnica*, Vol. XX, p. 24. Hard it is to decide in many cases whether we are dealing with mediaeval naïveté or brutality (cf. *supra*, Part I, p. 33).

[1] Cf. ten Brink, *Gesch. d. engl. Lit.*, Vol. I (1899)[2], pp. 353 f.

existence and the stamp of it is everywhere in the erotic lyrics they composed and sang.

As to the other question, how far we may trace in these lyrics the influence of Provençal and French prototypes—it is difficult, in the present state of our knowledge impossible, to attempt a definite answer. In isolated cases, of course, we may demonstrate that one Latin lyric or another came from specific French or Provençal songs.[1] But to ascertain in any general and sweeping fashion just in how far the love-lyrics of the goliards were conditioned by and shaped after a precedent body of vernacular court-poetry in France—this is quite a different matter. First, we must establish a codification of the melodies, verse and stanza forms, rhyme devices, etc., of troubadour and trouvère poetry; and then show that these were introduced into Latin lyrics of a later date than they. Second, we must gather the main themes and the particular treatment of these themes in troubadour and trouvère poetry and prove that at a later time Latin lyrics adopted them. Third, in many minor matters of internal evidence, such as idiosyncrasy of phrase and epithet, style and syntax, reminiscences, commonplaces, identity of petty mannerism, and the like, we must make apparent that the mediaeval Latin love-lyrics followed definitely in the steps of precedent vernacular verse in southern and northern France.

These things have already been done, it is true, in a detached fashion and with widely differing results. We have many studies of melodic and harmonic art during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries,[2] but still none that make reasonable the claim of France to priority where Latin lyricality is concerned. Investigation of French verse and stanza forms leaves us yet with the possibility that mediaeval Latin erotic lyrics followed quite exclusively their own traditional development.[3] Their themes, too, are largely akin

[1] By applying tests, for instance, such as those suggested in the Appendix, *infra*.

[2] For bibliography of this subject cf. the study of Lavoix on the *Musique au siècle de St. Louis* (in the second volume of Raynaud's *Recueil de motets français* [1883]), pp. 467–79, and the supplements of *Vierteljahrsschrift für Musikwissenschaft*, 1885 ff.; also David et Lussy, *Histoire de la notation musicale depuis ses origines* (1882); Coussemaker, *L'art harmonique* (1865), and Restori's "Note sur la musique des chansons" in Julleville, *Histoire*, Vol. I, pp. 390 ff.

[3] Cf. Wilhelm Meyer, *Fragmenta burana*, pp. 173 ff.; *Gesammelte Abhandlungen* (1905), Vol. II, pp. 30 ff. Meyer says: "Ich glaube bewiesen zu haben, dass die Deutschen seit Not-

to those of all the vernacular bodies of mediaeval verse and unless one insist unduly upon the evidence of MS chronology[1] there is nothing to be gained by the cataloguing of motifs that Latin poetry possessed in great part centuries before the troubadours and trouvères appeared upon the scene.[2]

Perhaps we shall never know beyond the shadow of doubt either of two things: first, that there were not written before the twelfth century by goliards beautiful Latin ballads of love;[3] second, just how great was the influence exercised by the Provençal

ker einen ununterbrochenen Strom lebhafter und kunstreicher Sequenzendichtung gehabt haben und dass von den lateinischen Gedichten der Carmina Burana sicher viele, wahrscheinlich die meisten in Deutschland gedichtet sind." Meyer believes in the priority of the Latin forms to the French: "Den Provenzalen und den Franzosen lag es bei der grossen Ähnlichkeit der Sprache viel näher und leichter, die kunstreichen Strophen der mittellateinischen Dichter nachzuahmen. Was bei diesem Streben die provenzalischen, die französischen und die deutschen Dichter geleistet haben, dessen Wert gegenseitig abzuwägen, ist kaum möglich und hat keinen Zweck."

[1] As one should not do; simply because a sort of Provençal lyric (based upon the time-tables of MSS which have chanced to descend to us) seems to antedate certain French songs by a few years; because again the latter precede by a span the German courtly song, and this German poetry anticipates the appearance of some Latin erotic verses—therefore what? For this reason alone shall we establish a direct line of evolution in four languages from Poitou to Benedictbeuern by way of Paris? I have already expressed my feelings on this head (cf. *Modern Philology*, Vol. III, p. 412).

[2] Latin poetry is the starting-point of any investigation of the mediaeval Provençal and French lyric. Failure to recognize this fact largely, at times entirely, nullifies the results attained by Jeanroy in his *Origines*. He would prove first that certain themes existed in France and that they later were developed in other countries, and all this is fairly true, especially when we accept his chronology as decisive and believe that *post hoc* means *propter hoc*. But there is nothing essentially French in most of the themes that he lists as fundamental ones; and as a matter of fact almost all of them can be found in Latin poetry known to us from a much earlier time than the one that he treats.

The only reason, of course, that we cannot discover many of these themes in vernacular poetry of the centuries precedent to the troubadours is that all of this earlier verse is lost, and there is but the indistinct mirage of it in the dull skies of Latin literature. There were minstrels who wrote well in Romance long before the middle of the ninth century, if we believe such testimony as the lines which summon poets to the memorial service for Adalhard of Corbie (d. 826):

> Rustica concelebret romana latinaque lingua
> Saxo, qui pariter plangens pro carmine dicat:
> Vertite huc cuncti cecinit quam maximus ille,
> Et tumulum facite, et tumulo super addite carmen.

Cf. Raynouard, *Choix des poésies des troubadours* (1816-21), Vol. II, p. cxxxv; Diez, *op. cit.*, p. 16; Rajna, *Le origini dell' epopea francese*, p. 326, note 2.

[3] Harping upon a single theme is tiresome, but I would again suggest that it is not beyond the realm of possibility that a new MS earlier in date than the twelfth century will be discovered in which Latin love-ballads are included; then may topple the carefully reared fabric of goliard ascendency in twelfth-century France. Without the Cambridge MS we should be without any hint of such a song as the *Levis exsurgit zephyrus;* except for Schröder's discovery twelve years ago we should not know that popular German dance ballads were being piped in the early years of the eleventh century. By so thin a thread does literary history at times depend. English literature furnishes two remarkable analogies. Were it not for one poem, *The Owl and Nightingale*, early transition English would offer us

lyric on the poems of the wandering students. We must be content to say that from the twelfth century on, impelled thereto by a new movement in literary art, goliards composed songs like the *Saevit aurae spiritus*, *Lydia bella*, and *Si linguis angelicis*, referred to above, like the *E globo veteri*, *Rumor letalis*,[1] and a host of other poems contained in the MSS of St. Omer, Queen Christine, and Benedictbeuern. Effective as these pieces are, they are still full of classical reminiscence, recondite mythological allusion, artificial verse structure, learned apparatus, scholastic subtleties, and mention of school and studies; they are poems frankly cognizant of the necessity for fleshly enjoyment, hungry for it, unsated by it, unabashed in the discussion of it.[2]

These poems, so far as we may judge by the MS evidence at our present disposal, were written by the goliards first in the twelfth century and in France. There is no inherent reason why Englishmen and Germans and Italians who had never been in any of the French schools may not have composed such verses, but proof of this is lacking. Current doctrine therefore may hold *en défaut de mieux* until we know more than we do or are likely to about the individual history of these fugitive Latin pieces. About a hundred of the love-poems in the *Carmina burana* belong to the type of erotic goliard lyric and may thus claim the schools of France as their birthplace, or—what is the same thing for our purpose—they were modeled upon songs which had originated there; they

but the dried curds of homilies, proverbs, and gnomic verses, didactic works like *A Father's Instruction* and *Paternoster*, the *Ormulum*, *Poema Morale*, *Bestiary*, and *Ancren Riwle*, Layamon's *Brut*, saints' lives, religious allegories, and uninspired planctus. But one poem and one alone is sufficient to mark the existence in this age of freshness and originality. It is known to us in two MSS, but others of its kind are known to us in none. Again: "among the Cottonian manuscripts in the British Museum, a small quarto volume numbered Nero A. x contains the four Middle English poems known as *Pearl*, *Cleanness*, *Patience*, and *Sir Gawayne and the Grene Knight*. No single line in these poems has been discovered in any other manuscript" (*Cambridge History of Eng. Lit.*, Vol. I, p. 357). Had this single MS not been found we should not possess three of the finest English poems of the fourteenth century, together with the "jewel of English mediaeval literature" (as Gaston Paris called *Gawayne; Histoire littéraire de la France*, Vol. XXX).

[1] *Carmina burana*, Nos. 40, 83; Dreves, *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XXXIX, pp. 363, 365; Wright, *Early Mysteries* (1838), p. 111.

[2] Cf. *Carmina burana*, Nos. 31–51, 53–57, 59, 60, 61, stanzas 9–16, 65, 78, 84, 89, 90, 95–98, 101–3, 105–18, 120, 122–29, 131–34, 137, 139, 141–44, 147, 154–61, 163–68. This list has no absolute value and is merely provisional. Learned goliard pieces these poems are, but not always in their entirety, for in certain stanzas of some of them we find intercalations or allusions of the popular sort. Such material will be reverted to below, in our treatment of "popularizing Latin lyrics."

were conditioned by the "French" spirit of their time. Without hesitation and without hair-splitting let us assign them to that country which appears to have first given them birth and vogue.

It may, however, be acknowledged that there is a trace of guile in this ready surrender of the goliard songs to France. For they are no more the poems we are seeking than were the *nugae amatoriae* of the schoolmen. Beautiful they are, many of them, but popular they are not, any of them. Dance-melodies are not heard in them. They have no establishable connection with the humble festivals and customs and speech of the people. Except in such instances as we shall find later on, where transmuted snatches of folk-song and vernacular tones intrude, goliard poems remain a learned thing, as far removed generally and generically from real life as the metrical faëry romances of French Arthurian tradition. They are not racial, not autobiographic. Sprung like *courtois* poetry from new impulses, they soon grow, just as this poetry did, "universal"—they become "denationalized." "Take ten lyric trouvères," said Louis Passy, "and you will not find ten men, but just one lone trouvère."[1] In like wise one goliard's lyric is apt to resemble any and every other's.

FRENCH POEMS IN THE *CARMINA BURANA*

In the preceding chapter we differentiated two kinds of song, the amatory lyric of known authors and the erotic lyric of the wandering students—assigning them both to twelfth-century France. There is no difference of opinion possible as to the first sort, the amatory lyric; but it was suggested that the second sort, the erotic song, might be born in any individual instance outside of France. There are at least five methods which have been employed by scholars to determine the country where such erotic songs originated, and it was my original intention to subject these pieces one by one to the five tests in order thus to marshal philological evidence in support of the statement that certain goliard pieces hitherto ascribed to France might be won for Germany. But I soon found that the accumulation of detail which this process

[1] *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, Vol. XX (1858), p. 1; cf. also Bédier, *Revue des deux mondes* (1894), p. 923, Jeanroy in Julleville's *Histoire*, Vol. I, p. 380.

of research necessarily entailed threatened to bury the main argument of my thesis so deep beneath a mass of debris that I could not expect even the reader trained to academic digging to recover it. I therefore have contented myself to allow French origin to any piece whose origin seemed uncertain, in order not to cloud the issue by petty doubtings. It is no essential part of my present endeavor to rescue mediaeval Latin lyrics for Germany; I want merely those that I may have after suspicion is stilled—any songs which in no wise suggest a foreign source and which are found in a German MS I shall assume to be native and German. Lest I should be suspected of not taking into consideration the five tests in the case of any song I hereafter examine I cite and discuss them all in an appendix at the end of this study. One other matter before we proceed further: Schmeller's text of the Benedictbeuern MS is untrustworthy. Before undertaking my work I used all the titles given below to establish as correct a version as possible.[1]

The lyrics of love now left us in the *Carmina burana* number some thirty songs: 52, 61, 63, 79–82 (81 is to be divided into two pieces), 88, 92, 99, 100, 108 stanzas 5 and 6, 112, 114 stanza 3, 115 stanza 1, 120 stanza 6, 121, 136, 138, 145, 146, 104, 119, 130, 135, 140, 162.

Six of these lyrics we may well assign to France, for they are Latin *pastourelles:* 52 *Aestivali sub fervore*, 61 *Ludo cum Caecilia*, 63 *Exiit diluculo*, 104 *Florent omnes arbores*, 119 *Lucis orto sidere*, and 120 *Vere dulci mediante.*[2] Such pastorals were

[1] *Carmina burana*, ed. Schmeller, 1847; fourth edition reprinted without change 1905: Wilhelm Meyer, *Fragmenta burana* (1901), *Ludus de Antichristo* and *Ursprung des Motetts* (*Gesammelte Abhandlungen* (1905), Vols. I and II); Martin, *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XX (1876), pp. 46–69; R. M. Meyer, *ibid.*, Vol. XXIX (1885), pp. 121–236; Wustmann, *ibid.*, Vol. XXXV (1891), pp. 328–43; Patzig, *ibid.*, Vol. XXXVI (1892), pp. 183–203; Dreves, *ibid.*, Vol. XXXIX (1895), pp. 363 ff.; Böhmer, *ibid.*, Vol. XLIX (1907), pp. 161 ff.; Bartsch, *Romanisches Jahrbuch*, Vol. XII (1881), pp. 1 ff.; Ilberg, *Zeitschr. f. d. östr. Gymnasien*, Vol. XL (1889), pp. 103 ff.; Ehrismann, *Zeitschr. f. d. Phil.*, Vol. XXXVI (1904), pp. 336 ff.; Lundius, *ibid.*, Vol. XXXIX (1907), pp. 337 ff.; Santangelo, *Studi Romanzi*, Vol. IV (1905), p. 299; Wallensköld, *Memoires d. l. soc. neo-phil. a Helsingfors*, Vol. I (1893), pp. 71 ff.; Ehrenthal, *Studien zu den Liedern der Vaganten* (1891); Peiper, *Gaudeamus* (1879)[2]; Gröber, *Carmina clericorum* (1880); Laistner, *Golias* (1879); Schreiber, *Die Vagantenstrophe* (1894); Dreves, *Analecta hymnica*, particularly Vol. XXI (1895); further, variant texts of individual songs published from other MSS than that of Benedictbeuern by Wright, Grimm, Du Méril, Müldener, Hauréau, etc.

[2] A *pastourelle* is a simple poem set in a rustic scene, graceful and trifling in tone, describing the meeting of a man of culture and an *ingenue*, generally a shepherdess. In no version that we have is this type of poem a *volkslied*, it is refined rather than simple, subtle rather than true. Curiously enough, the earliest example of the *pastourelle* is the Latin

sung in Provence and North France probably as early as the first half of the twelfth century and it is thought to have been long after this time that they spread across Europe finally to appear in fourteenth-century Italy as madrigals.[1]

Another group of seven poems has been assigned to France because of allusions they contain. These are as follows:

79 *Congaudentes ludite;* a simple dance-song of three quatrains and refrain in which occurs the expression *bela mia.* But it is not these words which seem to betray its origin[2] so much as the antithesis the song emphasizes of crabbed age and fiery youth (after the manner of the French *debat*) and the tawdry

song in the MS of St. Omer; cf. Mone, *Archiv f. Kunde d. d. Vorzeit*, Vol. VII (1838), p. 296; Du Méril (1847), p. 228; Pillet, *Studien zur Pastourelle* (1902), p. 9; Jeanroy, *Origines*, p. 515. For the history of this lyric form and complete bibliography, cf. the first chapter of Jeanroy's book.

[1] Cf. Symonds, *Renaissance in Italy*, Vol. IV, p. 156. I do not quite understand why we may not imagine No. 61 to be Italian, for it is found in an Italian MS. Symonds felt that No. 52, with its verse *sub olivae me decore detinebat mora*, must have been written near Como or Garda, although the facts apparently do not bear out his belief. "In the production of the songs of the wandering students, with their boisterous love of life, their fresh feeling for nature and their keen satire against the church, the Italians had no share at all, or at any rate a most insignificant one," says Gaspary (*Italian Literature to the Death of Dante* [1901], p. 45), and Straccali, Ronca, and Novati share this view. Ozanam, however, regarded the *Altercatio Helenae et Ganymedis* as Italian (*Documents inédits pour servir à l'histoire littéraire de l'Italie*, p. 20) and Hauréau ascribes the *De Phyllide et Flora* to the same source (*Notices et extraits*, Vol. XXIX, Pt. 2, p. 308), Santangelo (*Studio sulla poesia goliardica*, pp. 82 ff.) tries to prove a number of the *Carmina burana* Italian in coloring and in origin. It is perhaps unnecessary to say that the *Suevi* which Schmeller prints in the sixth stanza of No. 52 and which caused several scholars to assign the song to Germany was changed to *saevi* by Peiper and Laistner.

Several other poems in the *Carmina burana* are believed by R. M. Meyer (*loc. cit.*, pp. 222 f.) to be imitations of French *pastourelles:* Nos. 45 *Grates ago Veneri*, 56 *Saevit aurae spiritus*, 105 *Tempus adest floridum*, etc. No one of these pieces, however, can be copied from a *pastourelle* as the word is defined in the preceding note. My definition is based upon Jeanroy and G. Paris (*Romania*, Vol. V, p. 125).

[2] Unless we think a handful of words determine the nativity of a song. If we do, pray where were the following born?

Deu sal misir bescher de vin,
Tunc eum osculamur.
Wir enahten niht uf den Rin,
Sed Bacho famulamur.—No. 174.

Urbs salva regia
Trevir, urbs urbium
Per quam lascivia
Redit ad gaudium,
Florescit patria,
Flore sodalium.
Per dulzor!
Her wirt, tragent her nuo win,
Vrolich suln wir bi dem sin.—No. 181.

Compare with these the song mentioned on p. 74.

goliard phrase *militemus Veneri*.[1] The outcry of love with which the refrain ends, *da hi zevaleria*, has always sounded German in my ears when I remember various unintelligible *juchzer* which break forth from German popular poetry of love, but this is a mere matter of opinion and none can tell.[2]

80 *Cur suspectum me tenet domina?* The complaint of one suspected of sodomy;[3] five quatrains with the refrain *Tort a vers mei dama*. These French words do not necessarily make a Frenchman of their author any more than the practically identical line in Hilary's *Ad Petrum Abelardum* converts the nationality of the latter, particularly as another phrase of the poem bespeaks German origin.[4] But the song is perhaps best thought of as composed at a French school.[5]

81 *Juvenes amoriferi;* a simple dance-song of two quatrains with refrain. Contains no French word, unless *domicelli* and *domicellas* be gallicisms.[6]

81*a* *Doleo quod nimium;* a Latin-Provençal love-song of seven six-versed stanzas.[7]

[1] Most of the poems that contain this phrase are suspected of learned and clerical origin: e. g., No. 31 militare Dioneo lari: 35 Veneris militiam proponere; 37 sic et Veneris militia; 53 militandi studio Venus excitatur; 107 militemus simul Veneri; 124 signa Veneris militet; 128 jam dudum amoris militem; 144 militetis Veneri, etc.

[2] Jeanroy (*Origines*, p. 6, n. 3) thinks differently, as is to be expected. But R. M. Meyer, in speaking of two other *juwezungen* (125 *lodircundeia*, *lodircundeia* and 136 *hyrca hyrce nazaza trillirivos*) remarks: "the two refrains do not appear to be German because they are largely without the vowel *a* which is so predominant in German refrains" (*loc. cit.*, p. 189).

[3] Not the first clerk to report false suspicion in this regard. Cf. Hertz, *Spielmannsbuch* (1900), p. 376: "Meretrices publicae ubique per vicos et plateas civitatis passim ad lupanaria sua clericos transeuntes quasi per violentiam pertrahebant. Quod si forte ingredi recusarent, confestim eos Sodomitas post ipsos conclamantes dicebant. Illud enim foedum et abominabile vitium adeo civitatem quasi lepra incurabilis et venenum insanabile occuparat, quod honorificum reputabant, si quis publice teneret unam vel plures concubinas."

[4] The debatable line *nostra fuit Briciauuia* afforded Grimm the conjecture that Breisgau was meant (*Gedichte auf Friedr.* I, p. 177), but Du Méril translated the word *Bressia avia*, i. e., remote Bresse: in this he is followed by Hubatsch (*Lat. Vagantenlieder*, p. 90) and so French origin is given the piece. As if a German student away at school could not utter the preening statement: "Ah, Breisgau was free of this sort of infamy!"

[5] As may have been other songs presumably written by German students like No. 82 *Dulce solum natalis patriae*, 162 *O comes amoris, dolor*, and the *Hospita in Gallia* quoted above; all songs of parting. To the French school should go No. 83 *Rumor letalis* which bids farewell to an unworthy mistress, although this song is found only in German MSS.

[6] Cf. Voigt, *Quellen und Forschungen*, Vol. XXV, p. 34.

[7] Cf. *Fragmenta burana*, p. 8, and Patzig (*loc. cit.*, p. 197) for emended text. The song 81*a* is made by patching together No. 169 and the last six stanzas of 81.

83 *Rumor letalis;* a song of farewell to a faithless mistress in three eight-versed stanzas, three quatrains, and three stanzas of five verses each.[1]

84 *Tange sodes cytharam;* a pendant to the above. The faithless mistress has been replaced by a more modest love. Four eight-versed stanzas and four of six lines each; nasty in tone toward the end.[2]

88 *Tempus instat floridum;* the complaint of a deserted girl. Sorrows for the lover who has fled *in Franciam;* six six-versed stanzas prefaced by a nature introduction of three lines and refrain.

Now were it not for this last poem I should not object to surrendering to French originals and French models all the above songs. Who cares in any large sense whether higher criticism assigns one quatrain more or less to this country or that, because the sweetheart is called *bela mia* instead of *Flora mea*, because *hyrca, hyrce nazaza* is not so vowel-*a*-ful as *tandaradei*, because *Briciauuia* seems to a Frenchman to be *Bressia avia* rather than *Brisigavia*, or because *domicellas* is gravely averred to be *Mamsels* and not *Jungfern!* It hurts somewhat, I confess, to give over No. 83 so easily. There is no allusion therein to school or learning, no classical lore or mythological imagery, no unreal figure of speech. It is direct and tuneful as few Latin songs ever written, one of the few mediaeval poems I know where the Roman tongue flows as smoothly and truly as if spoken by an Augustan author. But we give it up for a most uncritical reason—the reason that has satisfied many an investigator in mediaeval fields:

[1] Also found in a Stuttgart MS of the thirteenth century; cf. Dreves, *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XXXIX, p. 363. Symonds (*Wine, Women and Song*, p. 129) says of the poem: "A remarkable specimen of the songs written for a complicated melody. The first eight lines seem set to one tune; in the next four that tune is slightly accelerated, and a double rhyme is substituted for a single one in the tenth and twelfth verses. The five concluding lines go to a different kind of melody, and express in each stanza a changed mood of feeling." Lines 17, 34, and 51 rhyme.

[2] Intricate in rhyme-scheme like the preceding poem. Jeanroy was able to clear up the meaning of four lines of it which had hitherto defied adequate translation:

Mittam eam in ambulis,
Et castigabo virgulis,
Tangam eam stimulis,
Ut facio juvenculis.
Vinculis
Vinciam, si consulis.

The comparison of the mistress with a steed would appear to stamp sufficiently this poem as of French extraction (cf. Jeanroy, *Origines*, pp. 53, 477).

the poem seems to be too sure and clever, too *gelungen* to be written by a German pen.

Personally I weary of the doctrine that German poets during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries were a trifle naïve and stupid, and therefore unable to achieve a Latin song quite so well as their French brethren. I will not exactly say that this is not so, especially if the song be a pretentious performance full of scholastic phrasing and formula, and I acknowledge to a sense of awe when critics play high trump cards like Walter of Chatillon and Hugo of Orleans, St. Bernard and Abelard and Peter of Blois, Hildebert of Lavardin (who has left us no lyric line more sincere than the hexameters of Fortunatus) and the rest of the brilliant company of ecclesiastics and schoolmen whose lyric production we have so largely to take on faith.

But if Walter did write the St. Omer songs, if Hugo did devote three living but rough poems to the courtesan Flora, they are none of them instinct with the feeling of the *Rumor letalis;* a piece so spontaneous in emotion, so flexible in meter that Symonds can compare it with Byron's *When We Two Parted* as a close analogue.

1

Rumor letalis
Crebro me vulnerat,
Meisque malis
Dolores aggregat,
Me male multat
Vox tui criminis,
Quae jam resultat
In mundi terminis.

Invida fama
Tibi novercatur;
Cautius ama,
Ne comperiatur.

Quod agis, age tenebris;
Procul a famae palpebris
Laetatur amor latebris
Et dulcibus illecebris
Cum murmure jocoso.

2

Nulla notavit
Te turpis fabula,
Dum nos ligavit
Amoris copula,
Sed frigescente
Nostra cupidine,
Sordes repente
Funebri crimine.

Fama laetata
Novis hymenaeis,
Irrevocata,
Ruit in plateis.

Patet lupanar omnium
Pudoris in palatium,
Nam virginale lilium
Marcet a tactu vilium
Commercio proboso.

3

Nunc plango florem
Aetatis tenerae,
Nitidiorem
Veneris sidere,
Tunc columbinam
Mentis dulcedinem,
Nunc serpentinam
Amaritudinem.

Verbo rogantes
Removes hostili;
Munera dantes
Foves in cubili.

Illos abire praecipis
A quibus nihil accipis;
Caecos claudosque recipis,
Viros illustres decipis
Cum melle venenoso.

I find nowhere else in the Latin lyrics of these times so earnest an apostrophe to a faithless companion. And the longer one searches, the more clear does this become. Let us read a few lines of Hugo's tirade against Flora who has left him, lines from a poet whom Wilhelm Meyer rightly considers *eigenartig, vortrefflich, lebensprühend:*

Quid luges lirice, quid meres pro meretrice?
Respira retice neque te dolor urat amice!
Scimus—et est aliquid—quia te tua Flora reliquit.
Sed tu ne cures, possunt tibi dicere plures,
Qui simili more simili periere dolore.
Teque dolor scorti dabit afflictum cito morti,
Ni dure sorti respondes pectore forti.[1]

There is food for reflection in the thought that we must deliver our poem of parting to France, although we can discover no other French song like it, although it hints in no way at this country or its institutions, although it is found only in two German MSS —and all for the reason above given which a moment's study

[1] "O poet, thou must not grieve thus over Flora the runaway courtesan. It is all very uncomfortable for thee of course, but don't worry to death. First, there's no help for it anyway, and then besides—let the muse comfort you—that sort of girl is not worth it. Listen, you inexperienced person, and learn of what clay such a maiden is made. Good things to eat and drink, pretty clothes and other rich presents are the only matters that count with her; they outweigh your person and your poems. If you cease giving her presents, she seeks out another patron who is generous and laughs at you; begin your gifts again and she returns to you. She is tender for money's sake, so that she can cajole much from you; how you secure it, if you ruin yourself in getting it—that's all one to her." Cf. Meyer, *Göttinger Nachrichten* (1907), p. 131. Hugo is hurt evidently in his tenderest spot—his pride. He wishes to worm out of his difficulty somehow and escape the malicious pity of his friends. So he pretends that he does not care much and publishes the woman as a common prostitute in order to save his own face. He succeeds but badly, although he gains here and there a certain pothouse effectiveness. If we compare this crude satire on fallen women, this first cousin to Golias, *De conjuge non ducenda*, with *Rumor letalis*, the lyric earnestness and truth of the latter at once becomes manifest.

convinces us is no reason at all. So set are we in our belief that France dominated the mediaeval lyric except for the crest of German *minnesang*.

But No. 88 I shall not yield to France. In this, the most beautiful or at least the most touching song which the Latin lyric of the Middle Ages has to offer, there is ample evidence of German authorship. When Jeanroy associates it with French pieces dealing with the same theme, he merely shows how great the gulf is which separates the two. Again I am going to take space to print the whole poem in order to establish my point the better; and because wherever I have come across it except in Schmeller's insufficient text the introductory stanza has been omitted, as being but some chance *anhängsel*.

It is this very prelude that gives dramatic tone to the poem! It offers us the nature-background for the passion which the next moment will unroll before us, it strengthens the romantic irony which dwells in the sudden break of mood that the coming lines bring. Heine, taught by the simple art of the *schnaderhüpfel*,[1] never gripped us with more sudden force than does this *planctus*.

1

Tempus instat floridum,[2]
Cantus crescit avium,
Tellus dat solatium.
Eia, qualia
Sunt amoris gaudia!

2

Huc usque, me miseram!
Rem bene celaveram,
Et amavi callide.
Rea tandem patuit,
Nam venter intumuit,
Partus instat gravidae.

[1] For a discussion of the theory that Heine got a certain use of the "pathetic fallacy" directly from South-German popular quatrains, see my "Heine and the Schnaderhüpfel," *Studies in Popular Poetry* (1902), pp. 13–23. In a reference to this study a year or so ago Walzel announced his intention to teach me better ways. I shall, I trust, never be unready to receive new light on any subject, but the odd thing about this matter is that I agree with Walzel as to Heine's debt to popular poetry, and it is only through a misapprehension of my words that he regards me as an antagonist.

[2] There are a few similar examples of *stimmungsbrechung* in German *minnesang*, the most effective of which perhaps is Ulrich von Winterstetten's *Sumer wil uns aber bringen*.

Summer brings again before us
Trees in leaf and birds in chorus;
Flowers are come to clothe the plain.
Forth from winter's fetters sally
Heath and meadow, hill and valley:
Roses red are seen again.
All the world to mirth is turning—
Only I alone am mourning.

Cf. Nicholson, *Old German Love Songs* (1907), p. 129. The restoration of the Latin text as here given is based upon suggestions of Wustmann and Peiper, and especially of Lundius, who I believe for the first time recovered the proper form of the last two stanzas.

3

Hinc mater me verberat,
Hinc pater improperat,
Ambo tractant aspere.
Sola domi sedeo,
Egredi non audeo,
Nec in palam ludere.

4

Cum foris egredior,
A cunctis inspicior,
Quasi monstrum fuerim.
Cum vident hunc uterum,
Alter pulsat alterum,
Silent dum transierim.

5

Semper pulsant cubito,
Me designant digito,
Acsi mirum fuerim.
Nutibus me indicant,
Dignam rogo judicant,
Quod semel peccaverim.

6

Quid percurram singula?
Ego sum in fabula,
Et in ore omnium.
Hoc dolorem cumulat,
Quod amicus exulat
Propter illud paululum.

7

Ob patris saevitiam
Recessit in Franciam
A finibus ultimis.
Ex eo vim patior,
Jam dolore morior,
Semper sum in lacrimis.[1]

There is of course no need of assigning to a French source this ballad of a pregnant girl merely because it contains the line *recessit in Franciam.* The argument of the poem is as follows:

Gretchen has been betrayed by him who loves her. Beaten by her mother and cursed by her father, she still does not dare walk abroad, for her neighbors nudge one another and make mouths as she passes by. For her single lapse from honesty she is adjudged worthy of the stake. Why prolong the tedious tale? She has become a mock and her breath is choked with weeping; the tears flow faster at the thought that a father's cruelty has driven the lover off to France.

Now there are at least two reasons why the lover is thought of as fleeing to France. First, this is his native home, as German folk-poetry has often considered it the birth-place of light-of-loves. *Es war ein Buhle frech genung / War erst aus Frankreich kommen*

[1] While the color of this stanza may perhaps not be said to be specifically German, it can hardly fail to remind us of many commonplaces in the *volkslied*, such as

Nu mag ich numme singen
Und mag kein freuden han,
Ich het mir ein bůlen erworben,
Den můss ich faren lan.

—Uhland, *Volkslieder*, No. 36.

says Goethe, but we do not therefore deem his song modeled on a French original, nor need we the poem in *Carmina burana;* in fact we should think it not so, just because France *is* mentioned. A French song would presumably make the lover who did the betraying an English or Italian lad. The other reason for mentioning France is that it is a foreign land—*terra incognita* to the fearful German maid—and so seems the more terrible as a place of exile for one whom she still loves. She has heard perhaps of the dissolute life there carried on by students and clerks and churchmen—rumors that have been much multiplied and magnified by more than one swaggering Meier Helmbrecht who has returned from his travels to strut about his native village. Again, then, the mention of France has a subtle poetic value which we immediately recognize but which tends to remove the song from its implied French origin.

But while these two reasons do not absolutely do away with the possibility of French origin, they still do not, on the other hand, prove German birth for the piece. Another and much more convincing reason does this. In all the length and breadth of mediaeval Latin lyric singing we have no other poem dealing with this theme which betrays half the simple sincerity and directness of this complaint. This assertion is not based upon subjective appreciation of the piece in hand, although that would not be here an unsafe guide; it is based on a search through all available printed material. Such search establishes the point that however betrayal of the girl may be viewed—warned against, guarded against, stormed against, or, as it generally is, treated mockingly and brutally, *bestiali more*—it is never but this once made the theme of a dolorous song. Here again, as in the case of the *verna suspiria feminae* and the "Nun's Complaint," we have a unique utterance.

The source of it, I believe, lies close at hand. Either it is one of the vernacular *frauenlieder*, examples of which we have in German *minnesang* and some of which find their direct origin in the *volkslied;* or the source may be the personal experience of the poet himself—something suffered or seen by him. For the first we should posit a rough or maimed snatch such as—

Komm her, lieb Janche,
Komm her zu mir.
Es ist geschehen,
Es ist vorbei;

beautifully deepened and environed by an individual atmosphere. For the other possibility we should imagine a poet like the sympathizing younger Schiller of the *Kindsmörderin*, or a Stephen Phillips when writing *The Wife*. Nor is this latter supposition nullified by two or three turns of speech in our poem which critics feel to militate against the pathetic value of the piece: *callide*, for instance, *nam venter intumuit*, etc. They do not indicate to my mind either rawness of statement or boastfulness of attitude on the part of the deceived girl. Consider:

The world is gay with flowers and love requited. Surrender to it has brought on an unheeding head shame, misery untold, and the end of all things. A girl has lost more than life; she does not reason, she seeks no comfort in excuse or protestation, she feels no remorse. In a short blunt fashion she reviews the story as she has done a hundred times before: she has loved "skilfully," her mother strikes her, she is a mock, her love is fleeing, and so over and over again. How could a mediaeval poet better picture the scene; how would a mediaeval maiden suffer. In just this way, or with a flood of protestation and wringing of hands?

There is another song which a Frenchman is supposed to have written because of the verse *placet plus Franciae regina:*[1] 51 the serenade to Flower of Thorn. Then why not ascribe to an Englishman No. 108*a:*

Waere diu werlt alle min
Von deme mere unze an den Rin,
Des wolt ih mih darben,
Daz diu *chünegin von Engellant*
Laege an minen armen.

The lady of both 51 and 108 is Eleanor of Poitou, the ideal type of beauty to two generations of poets. In neither case surely can mention of her indicate the provenience of such verses. Would

[1] Although Mr. Rand believes one might rather reason that France is not the author's country, but a land idealized and remote. "*Persarum vigui rege beatior* was not written by a Persian."

it have been just tactful, or safe, in either song to have chosen in her place some German princess? But again, as before, we meet in No. 51 turns of expression which may speak for Germany. The girl is described as *prudens*, which is *klug*, and *gracilis*, which is *schlank;* she is *pulchrior lilio vel rosa*, which is simpler and more direct than the customary *rosa rubicundior, lilio candidior* (136) or *nivei candoris, rosei ruboris* (118). The world is well lost for her, even the queen of France.[1] Death impends if she does not cure him by a kiss, as ever in the *volkslied* where *mund* conveniently rhymes with *gesund*.[2] It does not seem hardy to believe the germ of much of this song is a *volkslied*, however much Latinized the remainder of the song may be. We should not perhaps be overready to translate Latin songs back into German popular diction in order to establish a close connection between them, but on the other hand we must not studiously avoid the thickening traces of this diction which is now to meet our eyes, simply because it is found in Latin lyrics.

PHILIP SCHUYLER ALLEN

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[1] Who reads these lines without thinking of the 'vieille chanson' quoted by Alceste in *Le Misanthrope?*—

Si le roi m'avait donné
Paris sa grand' ville,
Et qu'il me fallût quitter
L'amour de ma mie,
Je dirais au roi Henri:
"Reprenez votre Paris.
J'aime mieux ma mie, o gué!
J'aime mieux ma mie!"

although this thought is one of the commonplaces of mediaeval poetry; cf. Diez, *Poesie der Troubadours* (1883)[2], p. 217, who quotes instances from Provençal, French, and Italian, as well as from German.

[2] Cf. also *Carmina burana*, Nos. 42, 102, 136*a*.

THE FRENCH PAST DEFINITE, IMPERFECT, AND PAST INDEFINITE

Prolonged as have been the discussions of the relative value of the past tenses, many individual cases of the occurrence of the imperfect and perfect are still refractory when measured by the usual definitions, and weary if not wearisome is the travail of certain writers who strive to fit them to their respective beds. Yet these procrustean efforts have not been without their value, above all if they have prepared our minds to readjust in some measure the framework into which the unfortunate praeterita, willy nilly, have been thrust. The definition which makes of the imperfect the tense for continuation or repetition may seem, when liberally viewed, broad enough to offer a place even to the wanderers who in various languages and epochs surprise us by straying into this fold; for they at least, whenever and wherever begotten, show some noticeable family resemblances. Manifold examples, however, of the first or simple perfect, or, to use the French name, the past definite, must be sadly distorted if they are to fit any one of the usual descriptions of the tense. This is equally true, whether we accept the past definite as representing a single act in the more remote past, or as a tense which we are to recognize by a tag, namely, the expression or at least the vivid suggestion of a date in the past, fixing, as the French name indicates, the past definite as a point, while the imperfect is to be looked upon as a line. Similarly the second or present perfect (past indefinite) can in many instances hardly be said to mark completion in the present to any greater degree than the past definite. Further, in numerous examples the past definite marks a degree of continuance or a repetition that certainly suggests the line rather than the point, and thus seems to infringe on the domain assigned to the imperfect. Add to this an extraneous but no less disturbing element, namely, the inroads the past indefinite has made and is still making on the domain which we all recognize as belonging by right to the past definite, and we can at least feel some sympathy

for those who suspect each new discussion of tense differences of being a *salle des pas perdus.*

Let us take a few examples, of the types often cited in such discussions, in illustration of the difficulties I have mentioned. I wish to bring out through them that the past definite does not always indicate a single act in past time and is not always fixed as a point by a more or less visible dating.[1] It will be noticed also how well many of them, according to the usual definition of the imperfect, might seem to demand rather that tense.

Petit à petit les ateliers se vidèrent.[2]

Tous perdirent leur temps; le faisceau résista.[3] (When brothers were making successive efforts to break the bundle of sticks.)

Napoléon fut un grand général.

Pendant quinze jours il travailla.

Plusieurs fois il perdit son chemin.

Elle n'eut jamais de réponse à cette lettre.

Malgré ses voyages et les soins du médecin, son mal dura.

If the impression I have formed of many of the discussions of this question is correct, their chief weakness lies in a desire to formulate definitions according to which a speaker is obliged to employ a certain tense under given circumstances regardless of his mental attitude toward the assertion he is making. The rules are too purely formal and fail to recognize the fact that the simplest thought is made up of a number of elements, some one of which the speaker usually selects and brings by one means or another into greater prominence than the rest. This is the cause which determines the choice of one or another related tense. What in a given instance determines the choice of the imperfect is not that it and it alone expresses duration or repetition in past time. Such a statement we have seen will not hold. The speaker uses the imperfect because of an intent *to stress, to fix the attention upon* the duration or repetition, and this the imperfect accomplishes.

With such a conception in mind, a slight alteration suffices to make the definition of the imperfect sufficient. Tense is not

[1] Even as a sign board for inexperienced travelers the naming of a date in the past may be a misleading guide. The following are excellent French: *Le lundi suivant, à deux heures précises, il entrait chez son ami; Une grande tristesse tout à coup l'envahissait.*

[2] Daudet, *Le petit chose*, p. 3. [3] La Fontaine, *Fables*, IV, 18.

necessarily the mere expression of time or of some modal quality;[1] the tense is rather chosen with a view to *stressing* a temporal or modal value.

The imperfect then is the tense used to stress continuance or repetition in the past. Mere continuance or repetition does not suffice to make the imperfect indispensable, as is seen from the examples of the past definite given earlier. The imperfect is brought in only when the speaker desires to *call attention* to the presence in the activity of one of these two elements. Properly speaking, the imperfect is a present in the past. The speaker, instead of looking back into the past, as he does when he uses the past definite, transfers himself to the time of the action, so that he is an onlooker. He announces the events in a form which is, so to speak, a present; he feels them as something going on (continuing), or recurring (repeated).[2] The transference of himself to this standpoint is generally due to his desire to bring out the prolongation of the activity.

This conception of the tense makes clear the cases where according to more inelastic rules the past definite would be expected. If an action which occupied only a quickly passing moment is expressed by the imperfect, the abnormal stress on duration where real duration is absent indicates that the speaker is immobilizing this action in order to bring it clearly before the hearer's eyes as in a picture, and the hearer's mental vision is so intently directed to this point in the succession of moments constituting the narration that he is hypnotized into seeing it as if it were actually before him. We have here a pictorial imperfect.[3]

Ils arrivaient au Pont de la Concorde, ils le traversèrent en silence, puis ils longèrent le Palais Bourbon.[4]

La lecture finie, le Père Alphée se dressait, marchait à grands pas. . . . . Plus calme, le Père Melchior félicitait Méraut sur son livre.[5]

[1] That tense can express modal as well as temporal quality is well known; see Herbig, *Indogerm. Forsch.*, Vol. VI, pp. 157-269.

[2] This is the reason why a succession of the imperfects forming a group usually indicates contemporaneous activities. They are all of a time which the speaker in his mental vision conceives of as a present, and present activities are essentially contemporaneous.

[3] See Brunetière, *Le roman naturaliste*, pp. 84, 85. For Italian examples see Fornaciari, *Studi romanzi*, fasc. 2, pp. 27-39.

[4] Maupassant, *Bel Ami*, p. 163. The two men had been walking on, absorbed in conversation. The statements which follow in the quotation as given indicate that the *ils arrivaient* does not mean "they were approaching," but "they reached."

[5] Daudet, *Les rois en exil*, p. 33.

In explanation of the not infrequent appearance of the imperfect when a verb of saying breaks or follows the quotation, there is often cited the fact that the action of the verb of saying lasts as long as the quotation and therefore marks continuation. If this be the speech-feeling toward verbs of saying, we should look for the imperfect as the usual or even the exclusive tense when such a verb accompanies a quotation. This is by no means the case. The usual attitude with reference to these verbs when used in narration is to consider them as narrative tenses. The occurrence of the imperfect is exceptional, and is produced in this way: the speaker begins the quotation without introduction. It comes to the hearer's ear as something that is being said. When the verb of saying is reached, the introduction of a past definite would set the quotation back into its place in the narration, and instead there is a strong tendency to preserve the vividness by leaving the hearer in the standpoint he has assumed, that of an actual auditor of the words.[1] We have what might be termed an auditive imperfect.

The fixing of quickly passing events by the use of the imperfect, when applied to a succession of activities, has a striking result: it hastens these activities, for, in order that they may all be represented in one picture, they must follow each other with such rapidity that they shall seem to be simultaneous:

Suffit, s'écria Sturel, qui rassemblait son chapeau, sa canne, ses gants, payait, se levait, décampait.[2]

The past indefinite stresses that the activity named is complete at the present time. But we are the creatures of our environment and we ourselves stand in the present. Thus there is a strong temptation either to move the past up into our own time, making of it a historical present, or else to stress the element connecting it with us, its present completeness. The French has yielded to both these tendencies in an unusual degree. Even in the stronghold of conservatism, the literature, the tendency at all epochs to link the past to the present is strong save where some grappling-

[1] The French does this in two ways: by the use of the imperfect or of the historical present. English, which lacks the first resource, makes constant colloquial use of the second: "says he."

[2] Maurice Barrès, *Les déracinés*, p. 344.

hook, such as a date or a set position in a series of events, causes the stress to rest rather on the temporal remoteness from us of the activity mentioned, and here the writer, especially the historian, loves to transport the action, grappling-hook and all, bodily into the present. In the spoken language past indefinite and historical present have between them left no place for the past definite.[1] Adam and Abraham, Helen and Héloïse, Caesar and Charlemagne, if they are to come out of limbo at all, must take their place in the full glare of the boulevards, and there is no escape from our own day and generation save in prophecy.[2]

Now if the imperfect stresses duration or repetition in the past, and the past indefinite stresses completion in the present of a past action, what is the domain of the past definite? Here we find a complexity in marked contrast to the imperfect and past indefinite, a complexity going back to the Latin, which owed it in turn to the various elements of different origin and value that were united in the perfect tense. Thus the Latin perfect embraced the *s*-perfects, *v*-perfects, reduplicated perfects, and the participial *-tus* ending in passives and deponents, and was capable of a variety of stress which rivals that of its French successor. What wonder then that there is difficulty in giving a definition of the past definite that will cover all cases. Stress there is, now on one thing, now on another. At times it is on the non-duration of the action —the point as contrasted with the line; at times on the inception or the completion of the action, attention being directed to one point in the line; at times the speaker is interested only in summing up continued or repeated action or in stressing the reality of his assertion or the fact of its lying wholly in the past. The past definite is the only genuine past tense. It embraces those assertions of past activity in which the person employing it does not assume the position of a bystander viewing an activity which

[1] So also the Latin perfect with its perfect and aorist functions, instead of being a tense with two distinct values, probably represents only an adjustment of past actions in general to a present standpoint.

[2] Even here we are none too safe, since *je partirai demain* is, historically considered, equal to *j'ai à partir demain*, and since we can also say *je pars demain*. The conversational tenses are then the real present, the historical present, the present perfect, the future and future perfect, replaced at times by the present and present perfect, and finally the imperfect and pluperfect, which rather than true past tenses are pictures on the walls of the present.

extends up to him (present perfect) or in spirit placing himself near the distant event (imperfect). He is looking back at the distant activity.[1] This fact explains why assertions represented by the past definite can so often be analyzed as resembling a point in space as contrasted with a line. The distant view is not suited to emphasizing the extensiveness of an object or to stressing the prolongation of an activity. The railway train far off down the track is but a dot; the events of a long episode in early life may seem as we look back hardly more than a mere point.

The essential trait then of the past definite is its removal of the activity from the sphere of the present. This does not necessarily result in stressing any particular phase of the activity, but does not exclude the stressing of one or another phase. From the standpoint of stress it determines a negative definition. The past definite represents past action in those cases where the stress is not on continuation, repetition, or completion in the present. The assertion may, and often does, involve any one of these three but the stress will not be there, for to direct special attention to these you will either take the attitude of the onlooker and employ the imperfect or you will bring the activity into relation with the present and employ the present perfect. From a practical standpoint then the past definite may be considered as occupying the field left free by the imperfect and past indefinite. If there be such a thing as a simple statement of a past activity without stress on any element, it will go into the past definite. If there be stress on some element the past definite will still be used, provided this stress is not on duration, repetition, or completion in the present.

Let us apply this to some of the typical cases where we find the past definite. *En m'entendant, aussitôt il s'arrêta;* the stress is on the non-duration of the action. *Tout à coup il parla;* the speech which followed may have been long, but attention is particularly directed to the beginning of the action: "he broke the silence." *Petit à petit les ateliers se vidèrent;* the activity was continued for some time, yet the stress is not on this but on the

[1] See Gildersleeve's comparison of the Greek aorist and imperfect, *AJPh.*, Vol. XXIII, pp. 250-52. Corbett's *English Grammar*, reprint of 1906, p. 135, furnishes an example which brings out clearly the contrast of the visualizing value of the imperfect and the backward look of the past definite: *Tous les jours les ouvriers donnaient de l'argent aux tyrans, qui en retour donnèrent aux ouvriers des cachots et des haches.*

fact that it was carried to completion: "the workshops became empty." When one brother after another had tried to break a bundle of sticks, La Fontaine says: *Tous perdirent leur temps; le faisceau résista;* the stress is not on the time consumed but on establishing the fact. *Il fut tout puissant; personne ne le craint plus;* here you are stressing not the fact of the duration of the activity but the fact that the activity lies wholly in the past. *Il était tout puissant* stresses the duration, and *il a été tout puissant*, which could have been used even in literary style in this very sentence, would stress the present termination rather than the past existence of his power. *Pendant un mois il partit chaque matin à sept heures; pendant quinze jours il travailla;* here there is certainly stress on repetition in the one case, duration in the other, but note that this stress is brought out independently of the verb by a separate phrase, and the law of economy dispenses with again expressing it through the tense of the verb, unless it is desired to give an additional stress to the element of duration. Similarly, when the meaning of the verb in itself implies continuation or repetition, the imperfect is not used save to lay an additional stress on the duration or repetition of the action: *Malgré ses voyages et les soins du médecin, son mal dura.*

As the past definite is the true past tense and represents the backward look, it tends to sum up and to give a comprehensive view of the whole activity. Thus it usually implies for us the completion of all the stages, beginning, period of activity, and end. The imperfect, representing the view-point of an onlooker, fixes some one moment in the activity, namely the one chosen by this onlooker, and neglects the rest. Thus it does not definitely embrace the inception and conclusion, and tends therefore to leave the duration of the activity undetermined.[1]

[1] Kalepky, in his illuminating articles on the two tenses (*ZfRPh.*, Vol. XVIII, pp. 498–510, and "Wissenschaftliche Beilage zum Jahresbericht des Folk-Realgymnasiums," *Program* Nr. 106, 1904), would even make the implication of a completion of all the stages of the activity the sole test of the past definite, and the absence of such an implication the test of the imperfect. Examples of imperfects of the types cited above from Maupassant, Daudet, and Barrès seem, however, to imply the completion of all the stages, and Kalepky's assertion that stress on the beginning of an action, with neglect of the completion, so frequent in the past definite, is not due to the use of that tense, but is a second meaning (inchoative), common to all tenses of the verbs in question, needs historical corroboration before it can be accepted. See Meyer-Lübke, *Grammatik*, Vol. III, §118, and also Kalepky, *Program*, p. 13, note.

Since the past tense to be used in a given instance is determined by a question of stress, of view-point, there will surely arise cases in which the choice will depend on the purpose or even on the general tendencies of the speaker. In a large majority of instances where we find the imperfect, it is the only admissible tense; in quite a number, however, this is not the case. In the following passage Zola might have employed the past definite: *Lui aussi la chassait, l'injuriait, en sentant remonter à ses joues le sang des gifles qu'il avait reçues. Mais elle ne se rebutait pas, elle l'obligeait à jeter la hache, elle l'entrainait par les deux bras, avec une force irrésistible.*[1] It must not be thought, however, that in such instances as this the imperfect and the past definite would have just the same value. The imperfect, fixing and prolonging the action, gives us a picture; the past definite is simply a narration. Certain modern authors, beginning with Chateaubriand, have a strong tendency toward imperfects,[2] some of them carrying this visualizing process to the extent of an abuse.

With the extension of the use of the past indefinite until, in addition to its original value, it has assumed in spoken French the functions of the past definite, the field of the past is, in conversation, divided into two parts, and a simple method of teaching the colloquial use of the past tenses is to define the sphere of the imperfect, leaving the rest of the ground to the past indefinite. The imperfect will be used when the speaker desires to lay stress on the duration, whether on account of its inherent importance or in order to visualize; elsewhere the past indefinite is the proper tense.

If this discussion has attained its end, I hope it may direct attention to the influence of stress as an element in determining the choice of tense, and to the possibility of simplifying in some measure tense-teaching by using, at least as one means, a negative test in explaining the use of the past definite or its conversational equivalent.

EDWARD C. ARMSTRONG

[1] Zola, *Germinal*, p. 416. Note the readiness with which there could be employed here the other method of visualization, the historical present.

[2] Compare for example the opening chapter of René Bazin's *Les Oberlé*, and numerous passages in Zola's works.

DUTCH CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE VOCABULARY OF ENGLISH IN AMERICA

DUTCH REMAINDERS IN NEW YORK STATE

The present paper lays no claim to completeness of statement. It is only a contribution to the subject, and but a beginning, both in the collection of material and the formulation of result, of the far-reaching and thoroughgoing investigation that the importance of the matter ultimately demands. To make such an investigation definitive would require a much more assiduous collection of the detailed facts of the case than has been attempted; and some of its most interesting phases have not even been touched upon. What has been got together is the apparent that lies near the surface, and much of it is well known. There are, however, questions to solve of sound and sense whose reasons lie deeper than the mere persistence of form, and into this wide field no attempt has here been made to venture.

The question of Dutch influence upon the English language in general is a comprehensive one. Roughly, there are three different heads under which it may be considered. First, the influence upon the common language, exerted at widely different times from Holland out, or in some cases from Holland through France, directly upon the English of England and then disseminated through the English-speaking countries. This influence was undoubtedly greatest in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as a result, on the one hand, of the extensive migration of Netherlanders to England, which began by the middle of the sixteenth century and reached its culmination during the reign of Elizabeth, and, on the other, of Holland's long commercial supremacy. The list of words introduced in this way and incorporated in the English vocabulary is comparatively a large one. Skeat gives in the *Etymological Dictionary*, with greater or less certainty, no less than 188. These words are of all kinds and embody some of the most familiar ideas in the language.

A second phase of this Dutch influence upon English also concerns the common language. It is this time exerted, however, not directly from Holland upon the English of England, but in its first process is the influence of colonial Dutch upon colonial English, which is followed by an ultimate acceptance, more or less complete, by the common vocabulary. The words thus introduced have come in at widely different periods, beginning with the early explorations of the English in Africa, where the Dutch had preceded them, and extending down to the present day. From the early time are the names, in particular, of many animals, *blesbok*, *springbok*, *steenbok*, *aardvark*, *eland*, *hartbeest*, and others; and words that have obtained even a wider currency, like *veldt*, *trek*, *inspan*, *outspan*, *commando*, *Boer*, and others, descriptive, in the nature of the case, of specific objects and conditions in a new environment. To these older words have more recently been added, especially from the late Boer wars, what is for the time being a rather long list of other words adopted for similar reasons, and especially by journalists, of a closer indication by their use of the conditions of specific locality. Many of these words used in the daily press and in contemporary novels and stories are doubtless doomed to speedy forgetfulness, and will never find their way into English dictionaries as permanent parts of the language. Others, however, have both a present and prospective importance and have doubtless come to stay. The dictionaries of the future must surely gloss, in this way, *commandeer*, *inlander* and *outlander*, *kop* and *kopye*, *laager*, and many others of the same sort.

The third of the categories under which may be included this matter of Dutch influence is the one with which this paper is immediately concerned. It is an influence exerted, in this instance, not upon the common English language, but upon the English language spoken in America. Sporadically, some of the words concerned crop up, here and there, in English books, but it is not likely that many of them, thus become specifically American by adoption, are in actual currency in England as elements of the general vocabulary. The influence this time proceeds from Dutch colonists who were not only the first, but for a considerable period were the only Europeans on the ground. They were presently,

however, as a power entirely supplanted, and though for a long time the two forms of speech, Dutch and English, managed to exist side by side, and even to some extent have continued to exist in this manner to this very day, Dutch is continually a vanishing quantity. Except in what is an insignificant part of its early territory, it has ceased to be spoken at all, and now lives only in scattered words and phrases, in a few proverbs and sententious sayings, in nursery rhymes and jingles frequently half forgotten or so disfigured and distorted as to be unintelligible to reciter and hearer alike, or in place-names that tell where the settlements of Dutchmen were located.

It is the purpose here to exhibit in some of its aspects the extent and character of this Dutch influence, as it now appears in those parts of New York State once settled and inhabited by Dutchmen. It is possible to do this only partially, but an idea may at least be given of the nature of these remainders and reminders of old language conditions that but for such traces have passed away and in their real significance are destined rapidly to be forgotten.

The history of Dutch influence in America has its beginning in 1609, when Henry Hudson the navigator, an Englishman in the service of the Dutch "East India Company;" sailed the "Half Moon" into the mouth of the great river that was ultimately to bear his name. During the next years, various Amsterdam merchants fitted out ships to barter beads and cotton cloth to the Indians for the rich peltries of the country, and by 1613, four houses had been built on Manhattan Island. The colonization of New Netherland really began under the "West India Company" in the spring of 1623, when the ship "New Netherland," with the first party of permanent colonists, arrived at Manhattan. Here some of them went ashore, while others proceeded up the river to Fort Nassau, just below the site of Albany—after a bit moved upstream to the site of Albany and rechristened Fort Orange—where a garrison of a dozen men had been placed some years before by the "United New Netherland Company." Another party of the same ship's company settled at a bay on the inshore of Long Island, subsequently called Wallabout. In 1626, Fort Amsterdam was built on the island of Manhattan, to protect the

settlement of over thirty log houses in which lived the greater part of the population of 200 souls, which in 1628 had increased to 300.

In 1629, the "West India Company" issued its charter of "Privileges and Exemptions" setting up the institution of "Patroon," or lord of the manor. The first of the patroonships, established, in 1631, within the present state of Delaware, was brought to an ignominious end by massacre and famine and was soon abandoned. The next one, set up by Michael Pauw, who secured the region about Hoboken and Jersey City, together with the whole of Staten Island, so called in honor of the *Staaten*, or States General, was only partially successful, and at the end of seven years was sold out to the company. The settlement, nevertheless, remained on the site of Jersey City, and the name of the original patroon has come down to this day in Pavonia.

The only entirely successful one of these earliest attempts at colonization was made by Kilian van Rensselaer, who acquired the greater part of what is now Albany and Rensselaer Counties, and settled in the region about Rensselaerwyk his colony of artisans and farmers.

During the succeeding years, the Dutch population does not seem materially to have increased. Colonists do not come out in any great numbers, and, as Fiske points out in his *Dutch and Quaker Colonies in America*, there is at this time "only a considerable trading station, with a group of tiny settlements" to represent the whole of the Dutch occupation.

A new era began, however, in 1638, when more attractive inducements to immigration were made by the "West India Company." Houses were presently built on Staten Island, and settlements were made on Long Island, at Gravesend, Flatlands, and Brooklyn. At Tappan on the Hudson a new colony was begun, and shortly after another settlement was made at Hackensack, and by and by at Yonkers. In 1649, a still more decided impulse to colonization was given by the mission to Holland of Van der Donck, the *Jonckheer* who had given its name to the manor just mentioned and the author of the *Description of New Netherland.*

In 1653, the population of New Netherland was about 2,000. In 1664, it was nearly 10,000, of which 1,600 were in the city of

New Amsterdam. It was not, however, by any means, exclusively a Dutch population, a fact that was particularly true of New Amsterdam itself. Settlements at this time extended widely over Staten Island and Long Island, which already had, however, a considerable English intermixture, up both sides of the Hudson to Albany, or Beverwyck, as it was then called, and beyond, to the northward, as far as Schenectady.

In this year of our Lord, 1664, New Netherland was granted, over the heads of the Dutchmen, by Charles II to his brother the duke of York, and on September 4, with the fluttering of a white flag over Fort Amsterdam, the rule of Holland in America came to an end. The temporary resumption of Dutch sovereignty, in 1673–74, has no significance for our purpose.

It does not appear that after the English occupation there is any considerable accession to the Dutchmen in America from without. From within, they continued to increase and multiply, for they were and are a persistent and prolific race, and they gradually extended their settlements all along the valley of the Hudson, and into considerable areas back on either side from the river in New York and New Jersey, and up into the valley of the Mohawk. Long Island, Staten Island, Manhattan Island, the counties of Westchester, Putnam, Dutchess, Columbia, Rensselaer, and Washington, to the east of the Hudson, and Rockland, Orange, Sullivan, Ulster, Greene, Albany, Schoharie, Schenectady, Saratoga, Herkimer, and Montgomery, to the west, is the territory in New York state in which, in addition to parts of New Jersey, the Dutch influence impressed itself most firmly and where, to this day, it has most actively survived.

In this hurried summary of the Dutch settlement no account has been taken of Fort Nassau on the Delaware or of Fort Good Hope on the Connecticut, both begun as early as 1623. An influence upon the language exerted from the first of these is inconceivable, and from the second is problematical and not readily controlled. To other conditions of contiguity and intercommunication, and not to this, are doubtless due the few Dutch words that have come down to the present day in the local language of New England.

The first period of the history of New Netherland, from the earliest time to the English occupation, is, of course, the Dutch period *per se*. In it the language of the entire region described is predominantly, and in some parts exclusively, Dutch. The people, although in new surroundings, still lived and thought and spoke as Dutchmen. A few even wrote as Dutchmen and thus made a number of American contributions to the Dutch literature of the period. Jacob Steendam, the first poet of New York, wrote here at least one of his poems, the "Klagt van Nieuw-Amsterdam," printed in Holland in 1659, and from this same period are the occasional verses of two other Dutch poets, Henricus Selyns, the first settled minister of Brooklyn, and Nicasius de Sille, colonial councilor of state under Governor Stuyvesant.

It will be seen that the actual period of Dutch immigration extended over scarcely more than forty years, but the period of language influence lasted infinitely longer. Owing to the conditions of colonization, which had begun even under the Dutch régime and were now rapidly developed under English sovereignty, the Dutch language inevitably made way before the English language. That this happened unequally in different parts of the country settled by Dutchmen followed as a matter of course. Fiske, in the book already quoted, calls attention to the difference in the attitude toward the old and the new in different localities at a little later date. Writing of the middle of the eighteenth century, he says that at that time, what as truly might have been said of any time during the Dutch occupation, except the very beginning, Albany was much more Dutch than New York, which was cosmopolitan, and he adds with perfect accuracy that "in general, Dutch habits held their own with much more conservatism in towns like Esopus, or Schenectady, or Flatbush, than in the center of travel and traffic." It is, however, somewhat surprising to learn that down to 1764 the Dutch language was still used exclusively in the service of the Reformed Dutch Church in the city of New York, although Dutch had not been taught for a century in the schools. In Flatbush, on Long Island, Petrus van Steenburgh, who was appointed schoolmaster in 1762, was the first who taught English in the school that had been established more than

a century before (1659). He gave instruction, nevertheless, in both languages. His successor in 1773, Anthony Welp by name, was the last teacher who was required to teach Dutch. These last facts are cited from the excellent book by Gertrude Lefferts Vanderbilt, *The Social History of Flatbush*, which deals with the whole colonial period. The author gives what is undoubtedly an accurate picture of language conditions in the last half of the eighteenth century, manifestly true of many more places than the one of which she writes.

> In 1776 [she says] in order to oblige the children to learn English, they were compelled to converse in that language in school and were punished if they spoke Dutch. At home, however, where no compulsory measures were used, they naturally fell into the old familiar words and their language there was still of the fatherland. At the fireside, on the farm, in the street, they spoke Dutch; the colored people in the kitchen, the master and mistress in the house, neighbor to neighbor and friend to friend, all conversed in Dutch. Business was transacted in that language, wills were written and agreements made in that familiar tongue; and on the Sabbath-day they read from their Dutch Bibles, sang from their Dutch Psalm books and listened to sermons in Dutch from ministers who, as late as 1746 [she is speaking of Flatbush], came from Holland.

That this Dutch that was spoken, as time went on, should become more and more perverted from its original conditions of sound and vocabulary is a matter of course. The degree to which this occurred depended wholly upon the circumstances of locality and environment.

The knowledge of Dutch influence, exerted primarily in the territory that has been described and then in part, at least, disseminated widely, is no new thing. The dictionaries have considerable lists of words that are derived directly from borrowings from the Dutch language in America. Most writers on Americanisms also take these elements with greater or less accuracy into account, and the histories which deal with the settlement of New York and New Jersey perforce use a number of them to explain the true significance of early conditions. No attempt, however, seems to have been made to collect these elements at any given time systematically together and to examine them carefully in their

linguistic bearings—a proceeding which their number and importance distinctly merit.

Of the words collected for the present investigation a number still remain about which there is doubt as to whether they should be incorporated in the list and for which it is not wholly safe to assume a Dutch responsibility. Words which have been at one time used, but have now entirely disappeared, as, for instance, *barraclade*, "a home-made blanketing," contained in both the *Century* and the *Standard* dictionaries, have not been taken into consideration, in that it has seemed preferable to make the present account of Dutch remainders a record of that which is, rather than of that which has been. It is quite apparent that a list of such material made fifty years ago would have been much greater than one made today. Some of these borrowed words have imbedded themselves fast in the vocabulary and will doubtless remain forever. Many others, on the other hand, were never firmly fixed, except, it may be, in restricted localities, and are continually in a process of disappearance. In the older books which take cognizance of such elements, like, for instance, Schele de Vere's *Americanisms*, published in 1872, there are a number of Dutch words cited as in use of which there has been found absolutely no trace. A revision of the list thirty-five years hence would undoubtedly show precisely similar results.

An element that has greatly complicated the problem of influence in the case of English and Dutch is the inherent similarity of the two languages due both to intimate consanguinity and to parallel development along broad lines. Dutch has undoubtedly often given directly to the vocabulary shades of meaning that occur in words which by easy change, or practically by scarcely any change at all, have been fused into identity of form with words of unquestioned English origin so that it is impossible now to tell where the English influence begins and the Dutch influence ends. This fact of inherent similarity in vocabulary and phonetic form explains, also, why the number of these Dutch survivals is not greater than it is. There never was a language brought into contact with English more assimilable than Dutch. Many words are positively the same in sound and sense, and others are so near

in both respects that the slightest impetus would turn them to the majority. There is scarcely a sound in the Dutch language that is not readily convertible into its English etymological correspondent. This fact has worked itself out, of course, in the history of Dutch assimilation. It has tended toward the ready absorption of Dutch elements into the vocabulary, and it has frequently covered them up so deeply that they are no longer to be recognized in their original genesis.

The *Century* and *Standard* dictionaries record a number of words, in more or less common usage, that they recognize as of undoubted Dutch origin. The list of these words as they have actually been collected in the territory under consideration is as follows:

boss, n., master, patron [Du. *baas*].
clove, n., cleft, ravine, pass [Du. *kloof*].
cold'-slaw', **cole'-slaw'**, n., sliced cabbage served as a salad [Du. *kool*, cabbage + *slaa* ‹*salade*, salad].
cook'y, **cook'ey**, **cook'ie**, n., a small sweet cake [Du. *koekje*].
crul'ler, n., a fried sweet cake [Du. ‹*krullen*, to curl].
dom'ine, **dom'inie**, n., a clergyman [Du. *domine*, a Protestant clergyman].
dope, n., a thick liquid [Du. *doop*, sauce, gravy].
dorp, n., village [Du. *dorp*].
kill, n., a creek, stream, channel [Du. *kil*].
kill'-fish', **kil'li-fish'**, **kil'ly-fish'**, **kil'lie**, n., a fish, especially *Fundulus heteroclitus* [Du. *kil* + fish]. The Dutch word was doubtless *kilvisch*.
o'ly-koek', **o'ly-coek'**, better **o'ly-cook'**, pronounced also **ol'ly-cook'**, n., a sweet cake fried in fat, a doughnut [Du. *olie*, oil + *koek*, cake].
patroon', n., proprietor of a manor [Du. *patroon*, patron, master].
Pink'ster, **Pinx'ter**, **Ping'ster**, n., Whitsuntide; now only in **Pinkster-bloom**, **Pinkster-flower**, the wild azalea [Du. *Pinkster*. Du. *Pinksterbloem* is the peony].
Santa Claus, **Klaus**, n., Saint Nicholas [Du. *Sant Klaas* dim. of Nikolaas].
scow, n., a flat-bottomed boat [Du. *schouw*].
scup, n., vb., a swing; to swing [Du. *schop*, *schoppen*].
slaw, n., cabbage salad [Du. *slaa* ‹*salade*].
speck, **spec**, n., pork, fat [Du. *spek*, bacon, fat, lard].

The statement in the *Standard* that "the form *speck* is due partly to G. *speck*, and partly to D. *spek*" is undoubtedly correct.

spook, n., vb., a ghost; to haunt [Du. *spook*].
stoop, n., entrance platform at door of a house, porch [Du. *stoep*].

vly, fly, vley, vlei, vlaie, n., a swamp, marsh, shallow pond [Du. *vallei*, valley].

waf'fle, n., a batter cake [Du. *wafel*].

The following words are contained in the two dictionaries, but with no suggestion of a Dutch origin:

blick'ie, blick'ey, n., a tin pail [Du. *blikje* (dim.), metal basin, bowl]. *Century:* [N. J.] but with no suggestion of origin; *Standard:* <Penn. D. *blech* <G. *blech.*

The ending *-ie, -ey* shows indubitably that the word has come from the Dutch diminutive.

tin blickey also occurs, with an obliteration of the real sense of *blickey.*

bush, n., a wood, grove, thicket, as in "sugar-bush," "Flatbush" [Du. *bosch,* same meaning].

Neither the *Century* nor the *Standard* suggests a connection of the word in this meaning with Dutch. The usage is not English; and in the many instances in which the word occurs alone, e. g., "to take to the bush," or as part of a compound in America and Africa, e. g., "bushman," "bushranger," "bushwhacker," and the like, it has undoubtedly come in through Dutch influence, exerted at one time or another, upon the vocabulary. *Standard:* **bosch,** [S. Afr.], with its true signification, but does not connect it with the above word. Both the phonetic form of the original and the presence of **bush** in the English vocabulary have made the thorough incorporation of the word possible.

dob'ber, n., a fish-line float [Du. *dobber*, same meaning]. *Standard:* [Local, U. S.], but no suggestion of Dutch origin. Not in *Century.*

dumb, adj., stupid, dull [Du. *dom*, same meaning]. *Century:* [Local, U. S. In Pa. this use is partly due to the G. *dumm.*] *Standard:* [Local, U. S.] Compare G. *dumm.*

The word in this sense has come in from both Dutch and German, according to locality, since it is used in territory where there is no thought of German influence, and, again, where there could have been no Dutch influence exerted.

file, vb., to scrub, mop, scour [Du. *feilen*, same meaning]. *Standard:* [Local, U. S.] Vb. not in *Century.*

file, n., mop [Du. *feil*(?) same meaning.] *Century:* In some parts of U. S., a cloth used in cleaning or wiping the floor. Also *file-cloth.* Not in *Standard.*

pit, n., the hard kernel of certain fruits [Du. *pit*, kernel, pith.] *Century:* Variety of *pip*, by confusion with *pit* [U. S.]. *Standard:* [U. S.] Variety of *pip*.

slaw'bank, n., a folding bed [Du. *slaap*, sleep + *bank*, bench; compound Dutch word in same meaning]. *Standard*, no etymology suggested. Not in *Century*.

snoop, vb., to pry into. Hudson and Mohawk valleys, to eat stealthily [Du. *snoepen*, to enjoy stealthily, to eat in secret]. *Century:* [Probably a variety of *snook*, M. E. *snoken*, to lurk, pry about]. *Standard:* [For *snook* <L. G. *snoken*, search].

snoop'er, n., one who snoops [Du. *snoeper*, same meaning]. *Century*. *Standard*.

snoop'y, adj., sly, stealthy [Du. *snoepig*, same meaning]. *Standard*. Not in *Century*.

All of these words, it may confidently be asserted, owe their presence in the vocabulary to Dutch influence.

In the following words the Dutch origin is correctly assumed by one or the other of the two dictionaries, but not by both:

hook, n., point of land, cape [Du. *hoek*, same meaning, e. g., Hoek van Holland]. This sense of the word is Dutch and not English. *Standard* has correctly [<D. *hoek*]. *Century* suggests no connection with Dutch.

hoop'le, n., a child's hoop for trundling [Du. *hoepel*, (dim.) hoop]. *Century:* [Dim. of *hoop*, after D. *hoepel*]. *Standard* suggests no connection with Dutch.

Paas, n., Easter [Du., *Paasch* same meaning]. *Century* has correctly (D. *paasch*). *Standard:* [Local, U. S.], but with no suggestion of Dutch origin.

The word also occurs in: **Paas-day**, Easter; **Paas-flower**, the yellow daffodil.

wink'le-hawk', n., an angular rent in cloth [Du. *winkelhaak*, a rent, tear]. *Century* has correctly (D. *winkelhaak*). *Standard:* [Local, U. S.], but with no suggestion of Dutch origin.

Also occurs as **wink'lê-hole.**

In the following words the correct Dutch origin is suggested by both dictionaries, but is not definitely assumed by either:

bock'ey, n., a dish made from a gourd [Du. *bakje*, (dim.) bowl, basin]. *Century:* Probably <D. *bakje*, dim. of *bak*. *Standard:* [Prov. U. S.], but with no assumption of Dutch origin.

fike, fyke, n., a bow-net [Du. *fuik*, a hoop-net]. *Century:* **fyke** [Perhaps <D. *fuik*, bow-net]. *Standard:* **fike** [Local, U. S.], but with no assumption of Dutch origin.

Also occurs as **fyke-net.**

log'y, adj., dull, heavy [Du. *log*, inflected *logge*, e. g., *een logge gang*, same meaning]. *Century:* [Local, U. S.] [Probably <D. *log*]. *Standard:* [Local, U. S.] [Perhaps <D. *log*].

Both dictionaries, in not taking account of the inflected form, have failed to reconcile "logy" definitely with Dutch *log*.

The following words are not found in the dictionaries at all. It is quite likely that many of them are in use only in restricted localities. Some of them, however, are widely distributed and are perfectly vital parts of the common vocabulary. It should undoubtedly be possible to add still further to this list, which, as has been said, is only tentative. The new words in their usual orthography are as follows:

afease', afeese', adj., *vide* **fease.**

aw're-griet'chies, n. pl., maize coarsely ground [Du. *aar*, ear of corn, +*grutjes* (dim.), grits]. Hudson valley.

bedrooft', bedrowft', bedruft', adj., miserable, despondent (contempt), sad, sorrowful, gloomy [Du. *bedroefd*, same meaning]. Hudson valley.

bin'nacle, bin'nakill, ben'nakill, n., the smaller channel of a river running back from the main stream [Du. *binnen*, within, +*kil*, channel].

Kil acquires in America, where it very frequently occurs in place-names and as a common appellative, a meaning which it apparently never had at home, viz., brook, stream, river; but it also is used in its original signification, as in Arthur Kill, i. e., *achter kil*, back channel. Widely used. John Burroughs, "Pepacton": "*binocle*, a still, miry place at the head of a big eddy;" *vide* also communication to the *Evening Post*, February 22, 1901, by Edward Fitch.

blawk'er, n., a flat bedroom candlestick [Du. *blaaker*, *blaker*, same meaning]. Hudson valley.

blum'mie, blum'mey, n., flower, blossom [Du. *bloempje* (dim.), same meaning]. Mohawk valley.

blum'machie, n., flower, blossom [Du. *bloemetje* (dim.), same meaning]. Mohawk valley.

boond'er, v., to brush away, drive away [Du. *boenderen*, to scrub, brush]. Hudson valley.

clip, adj., stony [Du. *klip*, rock, cliff]. *Standard Dictionary: klip* [S. Afr.], a rock or stone, cliff, mountain. Hudson valley.

coss, n., wardrobe, chest of drawers [Du. *kas*, chest; *kast*, cupboard, closet]. Hudson valley.

door'slag, n., colander, strainer [Du. *doorslag*, same meaning]. Schenectady Co.

fease, feese, adj., disgusting [Du. *vies*, nauseous, disgusting]. To be *fease* of a thing or person: e.g., I am *fease* of him, he disgusts me; I am *fease* of it, etc., which coincides with the Dutch usage. Widely distributed.

Occurs also as **afease**.

geheist', p. p. as adj., overreached, e.g., "he's *geheist*," he has overreached himself [Du. *gehuisd*, housed, lodged, domiciled]. Hudson valley.

grill'y, adj., chill, raw, e.g., "to-day is so *grilly* that I shall not go out" [Du. *grillig*, same meaning]. Hudson valley.

herk'ies, herk'eys, n. pl., haunches, e.g., "squat down on your *herkies*" [Du. *hurk: op de hurken zitten*, to squat; *hurkjes* (dim.)]. Schenectady Co.

hock'ies, hock'eys, n. pl., soused pigsbones, i.e., the joints above the *pochies*, *q. v.* [Du. *hakjes* (dim.), pasterns, hocks]. Hudson valley.

kip, n., a word used in calling chickens, e.g., "come *kip, kip!*" [Du. *kip*, hen, fowl]. Schenectady Co.

kon'kepot', n., gossip, huzzy, scold, e.g., *bedrufter konkepot*, a miserable scold [Du. *konkelpot*, same meaning]. Hudson valley.

lop'pie, lap'pey, n., small mat made of rags [Du. *lapje* (dim.), rag, shred, remnant]. Hudson valley.

mol'lykite', n., foolishness [Du. *molligheid*, softness, mildness, weakness]. Hudson valley.

mont, n., basket [Du. *mand*, same meaning]. Hudson valley. Schenectady Co.

niskeer'y, adj., curious, inquisitive [Du. *nieuwsgierig*, same meaning]. Hudson valley.

off'doch, n., inclosed stoop [Du. *afdak*, shed, penthouse]. Schenectady Co.

plock, v., to settle down [Du. *plakken*, to remain sitting, to stay long]. Hudson valley.

poch'ies, poch'eys, n. pl., soused pigsknuckles, i.e., the joints above the toes [Du. *pootjes* (dim.), feet]. Hudson valley.

poos'ly, adv., tolerably, indifferently well [Du. *passelijk*, same meaning]. Hudson valley.

prat'chie, prat'chey, n., talk, gossip [Du. *pratje* (dim.), same meaning]. Hudson valley.

proyt'el, v., to boil softly, to chatter, to prattle [Du. *preutelen*, to boil, to grumble]. Hudson valley.

proyt'ler, n., prattler [Du. *preutelaar*, grumbler]. Hudson valley.

pum'mel-ap'pelye, n., the berry of the wintergreen (*Gaultheria procumbens*) [Du. *pommel*, plant (?) + *appeltje* (dim.), apple]. Hudson valley.

slob, n., bib [Du. *slobbe*, same meaning]. Hudson valley.

sluck, n., swallow, draught [Du. *slock*, same meaning]. Schenectady Co.

spree, n., a homewoven bed-quilt, usually blue and white [Du. *sprei*, counterpane, coverlet]. Hudson valley.

stone'-rawp'ie, -rawp'y, ston'y-rawp'ie, n., a stony field [stone + Du. *raapje* (dim.) (turnip) field; cf. *raapland*, *raapakker*, *raapier*].

Stone Arabia, Montgomery Co., is apparently this word, although the connection does not seem to have been noticed. The Dutch word was doubtless *steenraapje*.

unno'zel, adj., silly, simple [Du. *onnoozel*, same meaning]. Hudson valley.

wurst, wust, n., sausage [Du. *worst*, same meaning]. Schenectady Co., and Hudson valley. Widely distributed.

The word in U. S. is due partly to Dutch *worst* and German *wurst*.

The borrowed words, it will readily be noticed, have, as was to be expected, only approximately kept their original phonetic conditions. The resultant English form which a word has ultimately assumed has been so largely dependent upon association through analogy that close conditions of sound-correspondence are continually disturbed and but few statements in this direction can be made of principles that are not frequently violated.

The Dutch consonantal sounds have been retained along various lines, because of identical conditions in the two languages. Unlike German, Dutch *v* is a voiced labio-dental, *w* a voiced bilabial, as in English; *s* and *z*, as in English, are dental spirants, the one voiceless, the other voiced. The Dutch *g*, as voiced guttural explosive in word or syllable initial, one of the most characteristic of Dutch consonantal sounds, however, has entirely disappeared at the expense of the English *g*. A reminiscence of the old pronunciation has been kept in the proverb: *Hain werk, hain brōd* (Du. *Geen werk, geen brood*), "No work, no bread," which

has been remembered in this form. *Ch* and *g* final have also lost the strongly guttural character that they had in Dutch, since these values are un-English.

The Dutch vowels have frequently been retained, or, in some cases, with fundamental consistency have undergone a definite change in their incorporation in the new language:

Dutch long *ā*, i. e., *a*, *aa* (*ae*), regularly appears in the English form of the words as *aw*, i. e., like *a* in English "fall."

Dutch long *ō*, i. e., *o*, *oo*, is regularly *ō*, i. e., like *ō* in English "no." "Spook," from Dutch *spook*, is an exception.

Dutch long *ū*, i. e., *oe*, has regularly been kept as *oo*, i. e., like *oo* in English "too." The exception in "cooky" and "hook" is due to the analogy of English "cook" and "hook."

Dutch *a*, i. e., *a*, has been regularly kept as *o*, i. e., like *o* in English "not."

Dutch *o*, i. e., *o*, has been kept as *u*, i. e., like English *u* in "but."

Dutch *u* and *ū*, i. e., *ŭ* as in German *Hütte*, *ū* as in German *für*, have disappeared.

Dutch *-je* final in diminutives, in which *j* is semi-vowel, regularly appears as *-ie*, written also *-ey*.

There are exceptions to almost all of these correspondences, as has been stated, due to the working-out of analogy suggested by English forms to which they bear a likeness. In all of these borrowed words, however, the Dutch form, without exception, lies, if not immediately on the surface, then but little beneath it, where an appeal to Dutch phonetics and an active consciousness of English analogy must straightway reveal it. Some of the words collected, nevertheless, are not so readily resolvable, a fact doubtless due in some cases to a lack of knowledge of dialect forms, or, it may be, of forms obsolete in Modern Dutch; for it must be borne in mind that this influence is of the Dutch of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, at which time American Dutch in the territory under consideration was cut off from the home language of Holland and left to follow out its own lines of development.

The Dutch influence, once paramount through the great part of the territory settled and occupied by the Dutchmen and their

descendants, is now but a fading memory that in many places has wholly vanished. The parts of the country under consideration that have best kept the traditions of the Dutch language are Albany and Schenectady counties, where some few people of the passing generation still speak their version of what was once the mother-tongue of their ancestors. The oncoming generation, however, knows no Dutch, here or elsewhere in this region, to speak it, and through this whole territory, with the exception of scattered words, it will soon have entirely disappeared and have become but a fact of history.

WM. H. CARPENTER

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

ON THE LANGUAGE OF CHRISTINE DE PISAN

For the language of the court and of the best society in Paris during the closing years of the fourteenth century and the opening years of the fifteenth, there is perhaps no better illustration than the writings of Christine de Pisan. Brought up at the court from the age of five, as she was, and patronized all her life by men and women of the highest rank, it scarcely needs proof that she wrote the dialect of the Ile de France.[1]

In this study the language of Christine is compared with that of her contemporaries and more immediate predecessors and successors of the middle-French period, and especially with the language of the sixteenth century as presented in the "tableau de la langue" in Darmesteter and Hatzfeld's *Le seizième siècle en France*. In her morphology, only such forms are mentioned as seem to add something to the sum of our present knowledge of the French language of this period. It is hoped that much repetition has thus been avoided, and that the results of the study may be more apparent and hence helpful.

The works of Christine here studied are those most commonly accessible:

Œuvres poétiques de Christine de Pisan, 3 vols., published by the Société des anciens textes français.

Le livre du chemin de long estude, published by Robert Püschel.

Le livre des fais et bonnes meurs du sage roy Charles (*Ch. V.*). (In three parts; cited by part and chapter.) Published in the *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de France*, by Michaud et Poujoulat.

Her long poems are cited by line:

Poissy "Le dit = de Poissy."
Juge. = "Le livre des trois jugemens."
Debat = "Le debat de deux amans."
Rose = "Le dit de la rose."
Ep. = "Epistre au dieu d'amours."
Ep. à E. M. = "Epistre à Eustace Morel."

[1] Cf. E. Metzke, "Der Dialect von Ile de France im XIII. u. XIV. Jahrhundert," *Herrig's Archiv*, Vols. LXIV, LXV.

Duc = "Le livre du duc des vrais amans."
Past. = "Le dit de la Pastoure."
Or. = "L'oroyson."
En. Mo. = "Les enseignemens moraux."
Pro. Mo. = "Prouverbes mouraulx."
C. = "Le livre du chemin de long estude."
D. & H. = "Tableau de la langue française au seizième siècle" in *Le seizième siècle en France* (7th edition).
Nyrop = *Grammaire historique de la langue française* par KR. Nyrop, 2 vols. (Vol. I, 2d ed., 1904.)

The examples for orthography and morphology are taken principally from the three volumes of the *Œuvres poétiques*.

VOCABULARY

The language of Christine de Pisan is a rich storehouse of both the old and the new. While she is a daring neologist, and while she often fashions her sentence in imitation of the Latin, she uses so many forms "déjà moisies," that her language bears a peculiarly archaic stamp. Michaud and Poujoulat, who publish in their collection of memoirs *Le Livre des fais et bonnes meurs du sage roy Charles V*, feel constrained to publish also a translation of it in modern French, while it is not thought necessary to publish a translation of the memoirs of Boucicaut written by one of Christine's contemporaries. The explanation of this is probably to be found in the fact that Christine was both a woman and a poet and hence doubly conservative, however much given to climbing the ladder of speculation (C., l. 1641), or to original research (*Ch. V.* III, 67). By the side of old words, some of which were evidently obsolete or obsolescent in her time, and many of which never entered classic French, are found synonyms current today: el, autre chose; ambedeux, tous deux; oncques, jamais; toudis, toujours (without the *s* of tous in Past. 1398); pesme, le pire, très mauvais; moillier, femme; vis, viaire, contenance, chiere, visage; estovoir, falloir, estre mestier, estre necessaire, afferir, convenir; cautelle, barat, boisdie, triche, tricherie, tromperie, menterie, faintise, feintié, fraude, decevement, decepvance, decepcion, ruse; ressognier, cremir, douter, redouter, craindre; apaisier, amaisier, recoisier, amolier, alegier, assouagier, adoulcir; sade, sanée, sage; esméré, monde, pur; folie, folour,

folage, foliance, sotie, desverie, forsennerie, forsennement; o, atout (Rose 100), avec (Rose 452); nacelle, nef, batel, vaissel, barge, navire; renommée, renom, fame, loenges (Debat 1703), loz, pris, honneur; tollir (toloir), embler, oster; mahagner, blesser; engres, entalanté, ardent. Mar (Vol. I, p. 170) is still several times used by the side of "en la male heure" (Past. 1840), now itself obsolete. Christine was the precursor of the modern novelist in describing the pains and joys of love. The lover has a mesaventure, a meschance; it is to him an infortune, adversité, mal, grief, meseur, meschief; it is considered by him a durté, griefté, nuisance, aspresce, desplaisir, maleurté (Vol. III, p. 236); it induces soucis, soings, sollicitude, cuisançon, peine, tourment, esmay, anuy, with feelings of tristour, tristece, pesance, grevance, desconfort, desplaisance, mesaise, mesaisance, angoisse, causing dehait, souffrete, marrement, douleur, dueil, dueillance, destrece, hachée (Vol. I, p. 286), martire, desolacion. The lover is triste, dolent, marri, adoulé, douloureux, langoureux, messeureux, mat, dehaitié, tané, las, rabatu, flati a cas, angoisseux, alangouré, descoulouré. The gamut of "joie" found in happy love is run on the words, delit, deport, deduit, leesce, felicité, joyeuseté, baudour, plaisir, souffisance, revel, aisance, rejouissement, esbat, esbatement, esbanois (Vol. I, p. 277), beneurté, boneur (Vol. I, pp. 227 ff.), solas, reconfort, consolacion, and the lover is then content, assovi, bault, lié, haitié, esleescié, eureux, envoisié, esbaudi, esbatant, esgayé, gai, aise, joyeux, joli.

Christine, as Commines after her (*Z.R.Ph.* I, p. 205), still uses dedens and not dans as a preposition. Chaque, which also "kommt bei Commines noch nicht vor" (*Z.R.Ph.* I, p. 498), has not yet superseded chacun as an adjective. Fors, found only once in Commines (*Z.R.Ph.*, p. 205), is found in Christine more frequently than hors. Moult, which disappears in the sixteenth century before beaucoup (D. & H., § 256), is regularly used by Christine. Beaucoup is found only once, and it is perhaps significant that this case occurs in one of the letters introduced into the poem "Le duc des vrais amans," "beaucoup de choses" (Vol. III, p. 167). As none of the examples of the word cited by Godefroy (biaucop in Froissart, belcop in Aubrion, A. D. 1468, etc.) present

the regular French form, *beaucoup*, this case in Christine in A. D. 1404 is of interest.

As may be seen from examples already cited, there is in Christine's vocabulary a large number of compounds now obsolete: encharné, deffuire, emblasmer, encerchier, emparler, reffonder, mesamer, atasser, etc. Some of these were perhaps of her own coining, such as desrudir, deffriture, under which Godefroy cites only the passage from her writings. Occasionally she takes liberties with words, using them in ways encountered by Godefroy only in her works, as for example, in Vol. I, p. 226, "Moy femme ignorant non savable."

Alain Chartier alone of Christine's contemporaries can compare with her as a "forgeur de mots nouveaux." Brunot has noted that her vocabulary, especially in her historical work on Charles V, contains many learned words (Petit de Julleville *Hist. de la langue et de la litt. fr.*, Vol. II, p. 364). But this statement scarcely suggests the extent to which Christine went in coining new words. By Godefroy or by the authors of the *Dictionnaire général de la langue française*, she is credited with using for the first time a large number of words: artiste, vindicatif, compact, pertinent, circonspect, influer, invective, palpable, stimulation, temporizer, investigation, préparatif, blandices, transcendent, harangue, etc. But the resources of Christine's vocabulary do not appear to have been exhausted even by Delboulle in his supplementary lists published in the *Revue d'histoire littéraire.* Oppiné is credited to Commines, and an example of concept has been found by Delboulle in the fifteenth century, but Christine says in explanation of Aristotle's definition of entendement that it is "le *concept* des choses veues, sceues, et *oppinées* par vrayes raisons" (*CH. V.* III, 5); cf. concept I, 13.

Difficulté, attributed to Commines, is repeatedly used by Christine: "A ce donques que ceste *difficulté* solue soit," etc. (III, 64): "quoyque le changeur y meist *difficulté*" (III, 25). Pontifical and graduer, of which Delboulle gives examples dated 1404, are repeatedly used by Christine, even in Part I of *Charles V*, written in 1403: "abit royal et *pontifical*" (I, 14); "*gradués* es sciences medicinables" (I, 14; cf. III, 70.)

No earlier example of inquisiteur has yet been found: "parce que il fu vray *inquisiteur* de haultes choses primeraines" (III, 3); convalescence and reputation[1] appear still to be attributed to later writers of the fifteenth century, though Christine uses them more than once: "Adont leur prist a dire de tres joyeux visage et en semblant de bonne *convalescence*" (III, 71); "ce fu prince louable et de digne *reputacion*" (I, 10).

Fabuleusement appears not to have been noticed until a century later: "comme il appert que *fabuleusement* ilz ont parlé des principes des choses" (III, 68).

An example of contreminer is given by Delboulle (*Revue d'histoire littéraire*, Vol. VIII, p. 491, 1901), dated 1416: "doivent *contreminer* et tant faire qu'ilz viennent jusques a la mine de leur ennemis" (II, 37).

Halo appears to be still credited to the sixteenth century, though Christine uses it in 1404: "des choses achéans au souleil et aux estoilles, comme sont diverses apparences qui aviennent en elles, si comme cercles, *halo*, queues,"etc. (III, 67).

Philosophique and indigneté, though used by Christine in 1402, appear not to have been found hitherto until a century later:

> Priant mercis par grant affection.
> Que reputé ne soit presomption
> D'escripre a vous de telle dignité
> A moy femme pour mon *indigneté*.
>
> —C., l. 28.

> Les lieux qui tant sont bel et gent
> Ou la *philosophique* gent
> Habitaient ou sommeton.
>
> —C., l. 1025.

With quotidiennement, 1476, compare cotidiennement, 1403: "par notable et bel ordre menez *cotidiennement*" (*Ch. V.* I, 20).

Several of the words given in D. & H. (§ 7) as sixteenth-century borrowings are used by Christine: "cautele," ruse (*C.*, l. 4961, etc.); "expériment," essai (*Ch. V.* III, 28); "fiction" (*Ch. V.* III, 68); "fonde," fronde (Duc, l. 3258); "impetrer,"

[1] Delboulle's citation is given in the Dictionary of D. & H. with the classic spelling in *-tion;* in Godefroy with the spelling of Christine.

obtenir (Vol. III, p. 265); "répréhension," réprimande (*Ch. V.* III, 68); "sollicitude," cause de souci (*Ch. V.* III, 63); "Vigile," veille (*ibid.* 50).

Naturally, in addition to the large number of words apparently coined by Christine, she uses a still larger number of recent formation. Her vocabulary alone might prove that she had studied, for example, Oresme's translation of Aristotle, made when she was a young woman. Such words as correspondent, habile, dependance, particulièrement, retribution, motif, colerique, juriste, and rural, of which she is so fond, have been traced to him. A host of words, which are now so inextricably entangled with our thinking that thought seems almost impossible without them, appear to have been neologisms to Christine: augmentation, infortuné, possible, inhabile, injurieux, fortuné, promotion, démérite, dissimuler, interroger, instruction, expédier, divulguer, impertinent, préjudiciable, frequentation, percussion, etc.

In Christine's best literary work, the "Dit de Poissy" and "Dit de la Pastoure," and some of her "balades," the number of learned words is naturally comparatively small. There are, however, balades which are as noteworthy in this respect as *Charles V* or the *Chemin de long estude*. On p. 212 of Vol. I is one of these. Here in twenty-eight lines are accessoires, fallible, transitoires, infallibles, corruptibles, sensibles, impossibles, where infallible is perhaps the earliest example of the word. The earliest (="qui ne fera pas defaut") given in Godefroy is from Fabri's *Rhétorique*, 1521, more than a century later: "Si sommes folz quant pour les transitoires choses, laissons les joyes infallibles."

Although Christine was by birth an Italian and certainly familiar with her Dante, there are few traces of Italian influence in her vocabulary. The Memoirs of Boucicaut contain a very much larger number. Christine uses capitaine, page, ambassadeur, but others had done so before her. The only word which may perhaps have been introduced by Christine was créature, in a sense approaching that of "favori." One of her letters introduced into the "Duc des vrais amans" is signed "Vostre tres humble créature."

To complete the characterization of Christine's vocabulary, her abundant use of diminutives must be noted. In this she may fairly be said to rival Belleau of the sixteenth century. (D. & H., § 10; cf. Nyrop, § 52, 3, Vol. I: "Malherbe condamne l'emploi des diminutifs dont on avait fait un usage trop large au XV^e^ et *surtout* au XVI^e^ siècles.") After her prime favorite seulette, which she succeeds in clothing with a wealth of poetic expression, come oiselet, cotelet, amiete, berbiete, erbette, allouette, femmellete, fontenelle, valeton, enfançon, oisillon, compaignete, jeunete, simplette, greslette, crespellet, sadinet, tendret, etc.

> Mignote estoie et grassete
> Et riant a voix bassete
> Et gente, ce disait on,
> Si fus de maint valeton
> Amée moult chierement.
> —Past., ll. 357 ff.

> Alors fichié s'est entre nous et mis
> Un ventelez
> Doulz et plaisant, qui nos cours mantellez
> Nous soublevoit souefs et freschelez,
> C'est Zephirus qui boutons nouvellez
> Fait espanir.
> —Poissy, ll. 151 ff.

In this "Dit de Poissy," thirty-six diminutives are lavished upon the charms of the lady heroine of the latter half of the poem, from her little chin, "gracieux, sadinet, Et fosselu, vermeillet, mignonet," whose sweets cannot after all be described, "tant est fin, doulcinet," to her little foot, "de guise nouvelete, Doulcetement chauciez" (ll. 1480–1571).

Orthography and Pronunciation

Upon the orthography of his time, Louis Meigret, writing in 1542, said:

> Il y a superfluité de l'*a*, en *aorné*, du *b*, en *debvoir*, du *c* en infiniz vocables, comme *faict*, *parfaict;* du *d*, comme *advis*, *adverse*, de l'*e* en *battera*, *mettera*, de l'*f*, en *briefvement*, du *g*, comme *ung*, *besoing*, de l'*i* comme en *meilleur*, de l'*l*, comme en *default*, et autres infinis, de l'*o* comme en œuvre, du *p* comme *escripre*, *escript*, et autres infinis, de l'*s* comme en *estre*, *honneste*, et autres innombrables, du *t* comme en *et*, copulative, en *faicts*, *dicts*, *vents*, et en tous les pluriers du participe

présent, du *v* comme en la diphthongue *ou* qui n'est pas françoise. Au regard d'*x* final, comme en *chevaulx*, *loyaulx*, il n'est point françois." (Cf. Nyrop I, § 90.)

A grammarian of 1400 might have made almost the same criticisms of Christine's orthography as Meigret made of that of his day. *A* before *o* in hiatus is optionally silent or syllabic in Christine's verse, so that it is probable that in the common prose of the time *a* in "*aorné*" (*Ch. V.* II, 16, "belle parleure, aornée naturelement de rethorique") was superfluous; *b* is superfluous in such words as soubmis, soubs, soubdain, doubter, debte, debvoir, etc.; *c*, in faict, dictes (pr. 5), faictes (pr. 5), effect, auctorité, aucteurs, mocquer, mocquerie, mecte, parfaicte, sainct, sçavoir, sçens, dictié, etc.; *d*, in ad (preposition, even before a consonant), adjouster, advis, advenir, admonester, adversité, mords, nuds, accords, etc.; *e*, in perderont (Vol. II, p. 67), etc., forms much less frequently found in Christine, however, than in Froissart; *f*, in neufve, souefve, briefve, griefve, nefs, etc.; *g*, in ung, besoing, soing, cognoistre, desdaing, baing, loing, enjoing, etc.; *i*, "comme en meilleur" (III, 196, etc.); *l*, in beaulté, nouveaulx, yeulx, doulce, chappeaulx (III, p. 97), faulte, vault, faulse, aultre, veult, loyaulté, tiltre, assault, haultesse, mieulx, oultrage, etc.; *o*, "comme en œuvre" (III, p. 207); œuf (III, p. 31); *p*, in compte, escript, escripre, recepvoir, sepmaine, decepvoir, dampner, prompt, loup, nopces, tempter, dompter, temps, corps, nepveus, niepces, etc.; *s*, in estre, honneste, "et autres innombrables;" *t*, in et (III, p. 202, and regularly).

The only restriction that must be made is that in the plural of the participles Christine only exceptionally writes *t*: cuisans, aduisans; faiz, fais, dis, etc. In addition to these peculiarities of the orthography of the sixteenth century bemoaned by Meigret, Darmesteter and Hartzfeld in their manual (§ 47, § 75) call attention to others which are likewise common in Christine's. Consonants are doubled: appercevoir, appeler, chappeau, soupper, affaire, reffus, mocquerie, belle, mille, villenie, parolle, nulle, estoille, homme, couronne, honneur, donner. Noteworthy in Christine is the frequent doubling of *t* before a feminine *e*: droitte, maintte, ditte, faitte, taintte; which seems, however, to be of no more pho-

netic value than the even more frequently intercalated (often where it never belonged) Latin *c:* taintte: fainte (III, p. 208); mecte: souffrecte : debte : seulecte : doulcecte : follecte : entremette (III, p. 271).

x has replaced *s* in voix, croix (Poissy 115); *s* is found after a long vowel even where it does not belong (cf. D. & H., § 54), "asmer" = amer (III, p. 133); "crismes" = crimes (Ep. 623); "peust = peut (Ep. 350); "fresle" (Ep. 379; cf. fraille, Ep. 533); "escuismes" = écume (Poissy 431); "trosne" (I, 256). On the other hand, cf. blamez (I, 67). *c* is at times written for *s:* decevrez (Poissy 691).

ss is sometimes written for *c*, and vice versa: "mace" = masse; "nyce" = nisse; "maistrece" (Duc 3264), "maistresse" (Duc 3272).

h appears in words in which it had been lost in O. Fr. and is added to others whose Latin prototypes did not possess it: homme, honneur, hostel, hostesse, habondance, huis (ostium), hui (hodie) histoire, humble, sepulchre, Helisabeth, eschole, deshencrée (Debat 1155), adnichilée (*Ch. V.* II, 39; D. & H., § 65).

Besoignes (III Duc, p. 161), compagnie (*ibid.*, p. 164) are found by the side of compaignie (En. Mo. 93); tesmoingne: s'embesoingne (Rose 376; cf. D. & H., § 71).

gn may be reduced to *n:* signe : medecine (III, p. 23, l. 173); commune: repugne (I, p. 13, l. 10).

No case of *s* for *r* between two vowels has been found (cf. D. & H., § 72), but *r* was of slight consonantal value, modifying simply the preceding vowel: fermes : termes; palmes : armes : blasmes (I, 242); fourme : homme (III, p. 24, l. 198); sage : voiage : heberge (Debat 857); "arme" = âme (Duc 3053).

The peculiar forms of *veuve* are noteworthy: vefves (Ep. à E. M. 172); vesve (Juge. 71). These are perhaps written on the analogy of souesve (Debat 1165), souefve (Ep. 171).

Evangile is regularly written euvangile (Poissy 492; cf. Deschamps *Œuvres*, Vol. III, pp. 159 ff.). The influence of the labial is also seen in "chieux, cheux" = chez (Ep. 120 ff.).

Final *s*, *x*, and *z* had evidently the same phonetic value: deux (<duos) : amoureux : deulx = deuil : seulz (<solus) (Debat 1316).

l and *f* were silent sometimes where today they are pronounced: auté = autel : beaulté (Juge. 551); chiefs : meschiefs : atachiez (Debat 801); vilz : plevis (Rose 318).

Letters inserted to make the words resemble the Latin etyma are silent : angelz : langes (Poissy 313); champs : chans = chants (Past. 73); aimeront : rompt (Past. 55). Occasionally letters were written where they never belonged: escoutans : temps : esbatens : contemps = contents (Debat 40). The letters dropped in O. Fr. before flexional *s*, though commonly replaced, are silent: coups : coulz (Past. 301).

The writing of est-ce as one word seems worthy of notice because it is so frequently found in Christine's contemporaries and successors:

> Ne te voy; as tu promesse
> Fait à autre ou pourquoi esce?
>
> —Vol. III, p. 249.

Cf. "Qui esse qui m'en blasmera?" (*Ch. d' Orléans*, Book XV, Vol. I, p. 132), and respons je : longe (Debat 850).

The points at which Christine's orthography noticeably resists classical influence are in the frequent *-cion* for *-tion*, in povre, pouvre (I, p. 74, l. 10), and in volenté, volentiers; confusion: destruction : entencion (Poissy 1925).

a

The termination *-age* is often written *-aige:* voulaige : couraige (Vol. I, p. 267); langaige : usage (III, p. 301); cf. sçay-je : sage (Duc 2721; cf. D. & H., § 23).

e

ai is written for *è* and for *é*, and vice versa: mainage (III, p. 36, l. 2); enamoré : morré (= mourrai) (I, p. 72); logié : j'é (= j'ai) (III, p. 207); hait (Duc 1571); "Plain" = plein, "vostre *plain* vouloir (III, p. 133); Helaine : saine (III, p. 247, l. 29).

e followed by *r* may become *a:* pars : expars = expers (C. 4450; cf. expers C. 4463); lermes : fermes : termes : armes (Juge. 844), an interesting rhyme as showing to what the modern form larme for O. Fr. lairme is due (cf. D. & H., § 25).

o

The habit of pronouncing *ou* for *o*, "De dire j'ouse au lieu de j'ose," for which Henri Estienne mocked at the courtiers of his day (cf. Nyrop I, § 160), was evidently prevalent in Christine's time, a century and a half before:

Aussi, se dire je l'ouse,
Un temps un petit jalouse
La vi, etc. — Duc 3489

prouffitable (Pr. Mo. 27); flourins (*ibid.* 49); voulentiers (*ibid.* 55); fourma (Rose 300); pourtrait (Past. 1935); but also

Bien est voir, si dire l'ose,
Que j'en fus un pou jalose.
— Past. 1910.

u

Note buvraige (III, p. 308, l. 15; cf. D. & H., § 31).

y

y is used as in the sixteenth century: diray, employer, foys, ycy, yrions, etc., joly : ly : poli : amoli (Juge. 696).

au, eau

rossignolz : mignos : aignaulx : lignaulx (Poissy 124). Eau = iau: biaulx vaissiaulx (Poissy 781); beaulté (Poissy 1130); beau (Poissy 1533); eaue (Poissy 145).

oi

oi is sometimes in rhyme with *è*, as already pointed out by Meyer-Lübke, Rossmann (*Rom. Forsch.* I, p. 169), and Metzke (*H. Arch.* LXV, p. 67): prestre : cloistre (En. Mo. 19); saussoies: voies : haies : gaies (Poissy 140).[1] Christine exceptionally notes *oi* by *oe:* despoeille : accueille (Debat 1862), an interesting case of contagion, though it may be a simple corruption for the sake of the rhyme.

ouë in the rhymes dourtouer : refectouer : lavouer : parlouer (Poissy 324), couvertouer, jouer : vouer (III, p. 301), louer, parlouer, mirouer (Or. 85, Vol. III, p. 4), is evidently to be treated as due to metathesis (cf. Nyrop I, § 518, 4 and Bijvanck's *Essai critique sur les œuvres de Villon*, p. 37). Yet it seems probable

[1] Rendait, Juge. 45, and faible, Debat 15, are perhaps simply typographical errors.

that in the case of dortouer, at least, there was confusion between *oi, oe, oue*, diphthong, and *ouē*, dissyllable (cf. O. Fr. dormeör).

Nyrop (I, § 160) notes that *poétique* is trisyllabic in Christine: "Le conteray par maniere poetique" (C. 42); but "Et meismement pouēte si soubtil Comme Ovide," etc. (Ep. 387). Since in the three volumes of her *Œuvres poétiques* published by the Old French Texts Society, the definite article is never written *el*, it is possible that poète is dissyllabic in l. 5988 of the *Chemin de long estude*, edited by Pūschel:

> Que prince se doie fiable
> Monstrer, privé et agreable
> A ses gens et grans et petis,
> Dit Tulle, el poete soubtilz.

oe

oe is commonly written for initial ue: oeil (Poissy 1105); frequently also in "joene, joenne" = jeune.

eu

eu<ǫ́ is still frequently written *ue:* cuer, suer, puet; but peut (Ep. 398), veult (Ep. 661), etc. eu<ǫ́ prevails, although *ou* is frequently found before *r:* douloureux : eūreux : savoureux (Poissy 1922); but courroux : jaloux : loups, doulz (Debat 1248); demeure, seccueure : pleure : queure (III, p. 247, l. 11); "eure" = hora: acuere : "meure" = mûre, "au seizième siècle encore meure," D. & H., § 34; I, p. 268, l. 18; serviteurs : cuers : labeurs : feurs (<forum) (Debat 1524).

-our is always found in amour and this word seems often to induce the use of the older form in other words: cf. "Et tous leurs meurs femenins diffamer" (Ep. 200), and amours : mours (Ep. 283, 284); amour : demour : umour : clamour (Debat 1904). As Nyrop says that the explanation of amour for *ameur is doubtful (I, § 182), it may be added that Christine treats the word with marked respect. Though it is written with an *s* in the title of her poem, "L'Epistre au dieu d'amours," it is evidently from no carelessness, but in imitation of the Latin genitive *amoris*, for with very few exceptions it is only after the preposition *de* that the form with *s* is incorrectly used. No writer perhaps was so popular during the Middle Ages as Ovid, and against his "Remedium

amoris," "Remède d'amours" (Ep. 283), his "l'Art d'amours" (Ep. 366), she was never tired of inveighing (cf. "Dieu d'amours" in Charles d'Orléans, *Œuvres* I, pp. 3 ff.). This classing of amour among proper names, as it were, may have had no small influence upon arresting its further development.

In "Le dit de la Pastoure," the form pastoure (cf. Nyrop II, § 406, 1) induces such an exceptional rhyme as *oure* = heure : pastoure (l. 661). There is also nou = nœud : Harnou (l. 154), in the exigency of rhyme with the proper noun, and flours : amours (l. 670); but elsewhere regularly *-eur:* heure : desseure (l. 85), couleurs : leurs (l. 510); monseigneur : greigneur (l. 563); suer: fuer (<forum) (l. 914); couleur : douleur (l. 996); honneur: deshonneur (l. 1070).

Paucum is written both pou and peu. Lor or lour for leur is not found. Heurter, which D. & H. (§ 34) say becomes hurter in the sixteenth century, is found in this form in Christine in one of her earliest *balades:*

> Car depuis lors j'ay esté si hurtée
> De grans anuis . . . .
>
> —I, p. 10, l. 19.

ui

huile appears in the form oile; oile : chandoile (Rose 564). anois (: degois), I, p. 35, l. 11. anuis (: nuys), I, p. 40, l. 13. poissant, poissance, are the common forms, but puissance, III, p. 308, l. 17.

ie

The suffix *-ier* counts as but one syllable after cons. + l, r.

> Et essaioit on destriers,
> Haultes selles a estriers
> Blanches et rouges et vertes.
>
> —Duc, l. 929.

The *ie* out of *a*, preceded by a palatal, is not yet always reduced to *e:* enchiere : biere (Rose 172); cuidier : ier (= hier) (Debat 948). "yerre" = lierre (Juge., l. 489) is dissyllabic.

-eil

-eil for *-ail* in travail, travailler, made a hard fight for literary supremacy, even if it were originally dialectic (cf. Nyrop I,

§ 207, 3 R.; Meyer-Lübke, I, p. 108): conseille : traveille (Debat 1628); merveille : traveille (I, p. 18); traveille, pareille (I, p. 77). Traveil, traveiller are not peculiar to Christine at this period (cf. A. Chartier, traveille : treille, "La Belle Dame sans merci," *Œuvres*, pp. 506 ff.; Charles d'Orléans, traveil : sommeil, *Poèmes Complètes* [ed. d'Héricault] I, p. 134; Rondeaux 43, 144, 65, 130, 167, 228).

-euil

-eil rhyming with *euil* is so frequently found in Christine and her contemporaries that Nyrop's statement, "La terminaison *-euil* se trouve parfois rimant avec *-eil*," seems scarcely sufficient (I, § 207, 4 R.). From the examples given by him it might readily be inferred that *-eil : -euil* was a phenomenon of the sixteenth century:[1] vueille : veille (Debat 1628); soleil : l'ueil (Debat 884, and Poissy 192); conseil : sueil (Debat 376); oreilles : fueilles (Poissy 1122); veille : recueille (I, p. 18, and III, p. 4); pareil: orgueil : oreille : vueille (I, p. 77); pareil : je vueil (I, p. 216, l. 26); s'orgueille : pareille (I, p. 290, l. 33); pareille : dueille (III, p. 21, l. 129); vueille, dueille : despoeille, accueille (Debat 1860); traveil: oeil (I, p. 101, l. 2).

Car le regart du trés doulz oeil
Qui m'a mis en ce dur resveil
Si persaument
Tant doulcement
Parfectement,
Me navra qu'adès en traveil,
Ne ne puet despasser le sueil
Un seul moument
Pour nul tourment,
Tart ne briefment,
De mon cuer, dont je m'esmerveil
Comment je puis avoir tel vueil.
—III, p. 315.

That Christine did not differ from her contemporaries in the use of this rhyme, abundant examples might show:

[1] Cf. Kastner's *Hist. of French Versification*, p. 74: "Occasionally the poets of the sixteenth century and those of the beginning of the seventeenth, more especially D'Aubigné and Alexandre Hardi, couple words ending in *-euil* with those in *-eil*."

Si m'assis dessoubz une treille
Dru de fueilles a merveille,
Entrelacee de saulx vers,
Si que nul pour l'espesse fueille
Ne me pouoit veoir au travers.
—Alain Chartier, "La Belle Dame sans merci," *Œuvres*, p. 506.

Pourquoy, servir je vous conseille
De nostre maistre Nonchaloir;
Et bannissez, vueille ou non vueille,
Soucy, sans plus vous en chaloir.
—*Poésies Complètes de Charles d'Orléans*, Vol. I, p. 188.[1]

GROUPS OF VOWELS

In the group *eū* of the O. Fr. *e* had undoubtedly become mute in Christine's time, though in the exigency of rhyme many cases are found in which it has syllabic force:

Mais la beaulté est en mon cuer conceue
De son beau pis, quant m'en souvient j'en sue
De grant doulour, car maintes fois receue
Par amour fine
G'y ay esté, etc.
—Poissy 1145.

Tant li seoit qu'il n'y avoit nulle ame
Qui ne deïst qu'oncques si doulce femme
N'avoit veüe,
De gaietté par a point esmeüe
Lie, jouant et de sens pourveüe
Si ot vestu adonc la trés esleue
Un vert corset.
—Poissy 1594.

But again there is the same confusion. As still in the sixteenth century (D. & H., §34), this group *eū* becomes one syllable, rhyming now with *u<ū*, and now with *eu<o:*

Comment chevaliers fors et seurs
De male acquisicion purs
Doivent estre, etc.
—C. 4403.

Si doit passer son sens
Tous les autres en bonnes meurs
Et en consaulx vaillans et seurs.
—C. 5508.

[1] Cf. conseil : mueil, Machaut, *Voir-dit*, l. 5705.

So likewise meurs (<mores) : meurs (<maturos) (Pro. Mo. 34); asseure : mesure (Poissy 1552); queue (<coda) : seue (<saputa) (Past. 125); meseur, dissyllabic (I, p. 9, l. 15), boneür (*ibid.*, l. 17). Fusse is found written feusse to rhyme to the eye with eusse, and seür is sometimes written sur: sure : injure, I, p. 286, l. 152; feusse : eusse (Duc 513).

> Que toutes sont fausses, seront et furent
> N'oncques encor nulles loiaulté n'urent.
> —Ep. 425.

"ut" = eut (Past. 1591).

HIATUS

In groups of vowels in hiatus in older French, other than that of *eü* considered above, it may be said that in Christine, *a* before *a* had lost syllabic force: gaigniee (C., l. 3758); aage (C., l. 1101); age (Poissy, l. 1316), as frequently. *e* before *i* had lost syllabic force as a rule, exceptions being often found: veissiez (Past. 150, 160, etc.), veisse (Poissy 407), are dissyllabic; veist (Past., l. 381) is monosyllabic. Meisme is ordinarily dissyllabic (Debat, ll. 651, 659, 823, 955, etc.) and occasionally written mesme (Rose, l. 432); but meïsme (C., l. 4659). *eä* has become regularly *a:* chance (Debat, l. 526); marchander (l. 1866); but *e* before *o* is commonly syllabic: cheoir (C., l. 1543), veoir (C., l. 756); asseoir (Past. 322), reonde (C., l. 3050). I have found only cheoite (Vol. I, p. 224) and choite (Vol. I, p. 6, l. 27) in which the *e* is lost, and rondes (Poissy 1154). *a* before *i* may or may not have syllabic force: haïne (C., l. 2243), haineuses (Ep., l. 634); aïmant (Debat, l. 1174). The same hesitancy is evident in the group *aö*, paour being monosyllabic in Debat, l. 1859, Poissy, l. 915, and dissyllabic in Past., l. 495; aoust is dissyllabic in Rose, l. 647; saoul is dissyllabic in C., l. 4621, but monosyllabic in Poissy, l. 294:

> Si fimes nous
> Tres humblement, si nous reçut trestous
> Si doulcement que ja ne fussions saoulx
> D 'elle veoir;

where it is evident our pronunciation of today was used, the *l* likewise being mute. So also the *a* has lost syllabic force in the verb saouler in Poissy 418, but in aourer, it is still syllabic in Past. 2228.

Seel is monosyllabic in Rose 581.
Fléau is written fleyaulx:

> Que c'est chose qui trop l'amant desvoye
> Et dur fleyaulx, etc.
>
> —Debat 972.

Reine is regularly roïne, roÿne (I, p. 227).

NASAL VOWELS

en, em, is sometimes written for *an, am*, and vice versa, as in the sixteenth century: "famme" = femme : diffame (Rose 454); "delittens" = delittans (Poissy 625); "consentens" = consentans (Poissy 1054). The various notations of lien are instructive for the pronunciation of *en* preceded by *i:* liain (Debat 1034, 463), lian (I, p. 90, l. 4); lïen : tien (III, p. 229, l. 18). These forms with the writing of singulière, sainguliere (Vol. III, p. 4, l. 80), would seem to indicate that already in 1400 the difference in pronunciation between *ain* (*ein*), *in*, and *en* preceded by *i* was slight (cf. Matzke *Mod. Lang Ass'n Pub.*, Vol. IX, p. 458). "Orliens" (Debat 1959) regularly = Orléans. "sain" = sein (Poissy 1547); villain : aim (Past. 874); ains : mains (<minus) (I, p. 75); moins: besoings (I, p. 56); non : nom (Poissy 2029); hom : raison (Poissy 2012).

D. & H. (§84) note a nasalized form of *ou* (=*en*+*le*) *on*, "dès le début du Gargantua." Though this *on* for *ou* has not been noticed, there are a few rhymes which would indicate that *ou* did not differ greatly from *on* in pronunciation: moult : mont (Past. 253); desmonstre : loustre (Debat 1479); fourme : homme (III, p. 24, l. 198); Longis : lougis (*ibid.*, l. 201).

MORPHOLOGY

Before flexional *s*, *d* and *t* are still generally not written: besoings (III, p. 16); coups (Past. 311); cerfs (C. 2330); blancs (Duc 1053); dis (I, p. 18); fais, tous (p. 24); amans: "Le Duc des vrais *amans;*" but exceptionally ditz (I, p. 116, Virelay 15, l. 15 and often); records (Juge. 890). *z* for *s*, especially used after a close final vowel as in the sixteenth century, is no longer common after *n* except in the preposition *sanz*, but after *l* mouillée *z* is still

ordinarily written. D. & H. (§ 78) say that the sixteenth century is often faithful to this tradition: "il l'étend même, puisqu'il emploie quelquefois le *z* après *l* simple:—*ilz* pour *ils*." But Christine a hundred years or more before writes *ilz* more frequently than *ils* (cf. Ep., ll. 112, 162, 206, 207, 314). Elsewhere after simple *l*, *z* is also often found: ceulz (Ep. 218); telz (Ep. 215); loiaulz (Ep. 241); subtilz (Ep. 306). Nyrop's statement, "Aux XV^{e} et XVI^{e} siècles on écrit *chevaulx* où le *l* vocalisé est représenté trois fois" (II, § 283) is true not only of Christine, who began writing before the close of the fourteenth century, but of Deschamps as well, whose literary career closed with the fourteenth century: maulx (Past. 402), chevaulx (Past. 480); pourceaulx (Deschamps, B. 1272); cheveulx (*ibid.*, B. 1266).

Words in *el* <Lt. ellum, still have the singular in *-el* with the plural in *-eaulx*, *-eaulz*, *-iaulx*, *-iaulz:* chappel (Duc 872), chapeaulz (Past. 279); coutel (Duc 901), couteaulx (Past. 391). No new singular in *-eau* has been found except in the adjective bel which becomes beau not infrequently when used attributively before a consonant: beau servise (En. Mo. 71); cf. Cui Dieux doint *mau* repas (Debat, 546). Christine is therefore very conservative in this respect, for Deschamps used the analogical form more often; cf. "Teste de veau" (B. 1272, l. 14); "nouveau fruit" (B. 1282, l. 16). Words in *el* <Lt. alem form the pural by adding *s* or *z:* mortelz (Debat 497); menestrelz (Duc 665). But three common words are also found with the old plurals: tieulx = tels (I, p. 56, l. 28); quieux (I, p. 185); mortieulx (Debat 501).

A few plurals used by Christine, variants not noted by Nyrop, are of interest: consaux, consaulx (Vol. I, p. 257, l. 36), is the common plural of conseil, though consail, as might be expected from the very freqnent appearance of traveil by the side of travail, is not found (cf. Nyrop I, § 207, 3 R.). Deschamps uses the same forms as Christine but Ch. d'Orléans uses conseulx (I, B. 68; Eustache Deschamps, *Œuvres*, Vol. III, p. 355; Christine, Vol. I, p. 257; Ep. 539; C. 5510, etc.). But Christine has apareux (Vol. III, p. 280, l. 5).

Deuil has the plural, deulz (I, p. 238, l. 3), but also dieux; yeux : dieux : yeulz : tieux (I, p. 144, l. 221).

Fils has a plural fieulz: "Car aux mères bien ressemblent les fieulz" (Ep. 757). In the seventh strophe of the "Lay de Dame" in Vol. III, p. 308, dieux = deuil and fieulx = fils are nominative singulars, rhyming with dieux = Lt. dei : mieulx : cieulx : mortieulx : yeulx : envieux : cieulx = ceux (cf. Nyrop I, § 354 R.). Chevriaulx = chevreuils (Poissy 573). Lignaulx = ligneuls, is particularly interesting because Nyrop says under ligneul: "Le pluriel *ligneux* m'est inconnue" (II, § 318; Poissy 124).

There is no indication in Christine that the *l* in fol or rossignol, whether in the old nom. sing. or acc. pl., was ever vocalized. Mol with flexional *s* has not been found. "C'est leur fol courage" (Debat 1329); "Il est trop folz" (I, p. 117); "Si sommes folz" (I, p. 212; cf. Ep. 295, 589; I, p. 4); "les folz cuers" (Debat 665); rossignolz : mignos : aignaulx (Poissy 124). So also espagnolx : mignos (Past. 514). The same forms appear in Alain Chartier: "le fol peuple" (Quad. p. 422 of his *Œuvres*), "les fols mariniers" (Curial, p. 400). It is curious to find (Nyrop II, § 323) that Deschamps is credited with remaking a plural molz because he writes "Adieu molz liz," when he still rhymes folz with "mos" = mots (B. 1279), and writes foulz within the line (B. 1268).

> La veissiez vous de beaulx coups
> Lancier sur teste et sur coulz.
> —Past. 301.

If Christine uses vieulz, vieux, in the singular it cannot be called a plural form as claimed by Lanoue in 1596 (cf. Nyrop II, § 315), but the old nom. sing.: "qu'il est ja vieulz homs" (Ep. 339). Verde (Poissy 162, 102; I, p. 210, l. 4) so early repeatedly used is noteworthy (cf. Nyrop II, § 413, 7).

Grande is used attributively as well as predicatively (cf. Nyrop II, §§ 385, 386). Duc offers with many examples of grant, three examples of grande: "comme elle est plus grande" (III, p. 165); "ces grandes lettres" (III, p. 174); "la grande lettre" (l. 3231). In the same work grandement is used seven times: ll. 2231, 1952, 1594, 2176, and in the prose on pp. 161, 170, 180, the old form granment being found only once (l. 3002). So early established, it is not surprising that, contrary to the history of new formations

of adverbs on adjectives in *-ant* and *-ent*, grandement survived. Likewise présentement (I, p. 158; cf. Nyrop II, § 386, 3).

Only once has grant been noticed written grand in Christine: "en tres grand humblece" (Duc 634).

Haultiesme appears to be a form of superlative peculiar to Christine, for it is not mentioned by Godefroy or Nyrop. It is found in rhyme only with ordinal numbers (C. 527, 1776, 4146).

PRONOUNS

No case of *ils* for *elles* has been noticed; *elz* for *elles* (Ep. 685). Once *i* is written for *il:* "Je pry a Dieu qu'i gart la blanche et blonde" (III, p. 286). The pronoun je following the verb may bear the accent:

Monseigneur, trop tarde jé;
S'il vous plaist, prendray congié.
—Past. 690.

"Ne d'autre riens n'ay envie
Fors que nous chantions ensemble,
Il n'y pense, ce me semble,
Autre mal et non fais jé."
"Hé Dieux! que c'est bien songé!"
—Past. 883.

Ley = le seems not to be noticed by Nyrop:

Aimes Dieu de toute ta force
Crains ley et du servir t'éfforce.
—En. Mo. II.

Vueille ou non, d'un seul me souvient.
Aime ley; si feras que sage.
—Past. 1561.

Yet it is not peculiar to Christine:

Tres doulces flours, d'amour puis et fontaine,
A vous se vient rendre Eustace Morel;
Recevez lay; car qui veult vie saine
A Nyeppe voit, etc.
—E. Deschamps, Vol. III, p. 359.[1]

If Nyrop's statement be true that after the fourteenth century cui disappears entirely from the written language (II, § 569, 3) Christine must be considered as belonging to the fourteenth rather

[1] Cf. also *Le Myst. du Vieil Test.*, 1461: Privez lay du lieu de delice Comme mauldit, and also 4672, 5179, 5673, 6518, etc.

than to the fifteenth century, for she occasionally uses cui: "Cui mon service ottroy" (I, p. 232, l. 33):

> Ne te pares d'autrui affiche
> Car cil, cui elle est, s'on t'en loe
> Tost dira que la chose est soe.
>
> —En. Mo. 81.

POSSESSIVES

Christine uses all the modern forms but also old ones: "la moye" (III, p. 133); "la moye doleur" (Duc 1459); "la sienne amour" (Ep. 458); "vostre joye et vo santé" (Duc 1685); "soe" (En. Mo. 81); "si sorcil = ses sourcils" (Poissy 1493); "mi oeil," nom. pl. (Past. 2000).

THE VERB

Present Tense

D. & H., in their paradigm of the verb in the sixteenth century, give (§ 104) for the first person of the present indicative of verbs of the partir, devoir and rendre type, part, doi, rend, or ren, remarking (§ 108): "Toutefois on voit paraître au seizième siècle, bien plus tôt même, dès le treizième siècle, cette *s* qui serait due à l'analogie de la seconde personne," citing, "j'entens," "je tiens," and two examples of "je suis." According to Nyrop (II, § 118), "Les formes étymologiques sont encore prépondérantes au XV^e^ siècle." In Christine "je suis" is the regular form (Juge. 89, 91, 92, 141, etc.).

In verbs of the partir and rendre type forms in *s* decidedly predominate: The forms of all the verbs of these conjugations in the pr. ind. sing. 1, found in "L'Epistre au dieu d'amours," written in "l'an de grace mil trois cens quatrevins et dix et neuf," (l. 779) are: "je leur deffens" (ll. 70, 744); "je consens" (l. 70); "je depart" (l. 72) (cf. pars iii, p. 191); "je deffens" (l. 75); "je rens" (l. 86); "je dis" (ll. 181, 206); "je di" (ll. 217, 611, 711); "je tiens" (ll. 238, 241, 282); "j'entens" (l. 289); "je metz" (l. 299; cf. mets, III, p. 246); "je respons" (ll. 313, 419); "je consens" (l. 670); "je conclus" (ll. 715, 722, 775).

The prose letters in Duc show still more plainly the prevalence of the *s* forms. Besides "je suis" invariably (12 times)

there are "je viens," "je dis" (4); "je dy," "je di," "adviens," "rescrips," "deffens," "tiens" (3), "escrips" (5), "promet" (2), "rens" (2), "sers," "crains," "repens," "requier."

On the other hand in verbs of the devoir type the *s* appears less frequently than in the sixteenth century: aperçois (Ep. 480); dois (III, p. 277, l. 13; p. 299, l. 21); veulx (III, p. 280); "j'en vaulx mieulx" (III, p. 243).

In the third person singular of verbs in *-dre*, Nyrop remarks (II, § 53, R.) that the orthography with *d* "se montre déjà au XV^e^ siècle." Some forms in *d* appear in Christine: mord, s'amord, remord (Vol. I, p. 15); tend (Past. 1094); respond (Past. 934, 1708); remord (Poissy 1333); fond (Vol. I, p. 91); rend (Debat 1076, 1077).

In speaking of the endings of the first person plural in *-on* for *-ons*, Nyrop says: "Ce phenomène est surtout propre aux dialectes de l'Ouest. On le retrouve encore au XIV^e^ siécle" (II, § 54, R. 2; cf. D. & H., § 109). Christine has not seldom forms in *-on*, demandon (III, p. 278, l. 2); alion : deslion (I, p. 285). Alain Chartier also uses it:

> Et a nous deux vueille pardon
> Octroyer qu'ainsi ne tardon
> L'ung apres l'autre, ainçois gardon
> Par sa pitié
> Vifs et mors la nostre amitié.
> —"Livre des quatre dames," *Œuvres*, p. 615.

In the second person plural of the present subjunctive, the regularity of the ending *-iez* so early as in Christine is remarkable (cf. Nyrop II, § 136, 3: "On ne s'est servi régulièrement de *-iez* qu'à partir de 1500").

All the cases of 2d pl. pr. subj. found in Duc are: soiez (26); faciez (882); ayez (180); aiez (886); disiez (1944, 2141); amiez (1445); mandiez (1991); voiez (2000); chaciez (133); reteniez (137); ordeniez (161); vueilliez (162); sachiez (171); essaiez (3184); fortraiez (3196); retraiez (3194); deportiez (174); souffriez (3266).

In the first person plural *-ions* is the regular form; chantions (Past. 880); rarely is *-ons* found for *-ions:* "Si est mestier que

nous en donnons garde" (III, p. 247, l. 8). Only once has *-iens* been noted: "A fin que faisiens" (I, p. 275, l. 6).

Imperfect and Conditional Tenses

The regularity of the ending *-oie* of the first person singular, *-oies* of the second person singular, and *-oient* of the third person plural, with the *e* having syllabic force, is matter for surprise in work so late as Christine's (cf. Nyrop II, § 161, 1, 2, 6):

Non obstant que mes compagnes
Veoye par ces champaignes.
—Past. 368.

Il te convient regarder
A ton honneur, ou, sans doubte
Tost la perderoies toute.
—Past. 895.

La soubz le chaine ramage
S'assembloient pastourelles
—Past. 139.

Cf. Past. 459, 963, 966, 1455, 1576, etc.; Juge. 727, 798, 1257, etc.; Poissy 117–20, 1202, etc.; C. 117, 300, 313, 514, etc.

Very exceptionally is the form avoy found: Si n'avoy je chose aucune (Duc 465).

In the plural, *-ions*, *-iez* are monosyllabic (Juge. 586; Past. 2156).

The old imperfect of être, iere, which Nyrop says "ne s'emploie guère après 1300" (II, § 162), is very frequently found in Christine. In Duc, the first person singular is found twice:

Car saouler ne m'en pouoye
Quant telz nouvelles j'ouoye
Dont je yere reconforté.
—Duc 2393.

Et en grant peril, venue
Est en un lieu ou je yere.
—Duc 3407.

For the third person singular, iert, yert is found 13 times (ll. 550, 691, 785, 1124, 1330, 1348, 1814, 2505, 2513, 2631, 2894, 3493, p. 206, l. 87); ert 5 times (ll. 110, 143, 428, 984, 2246); iere, yere 5 times (ll. 564, 1115, 1734, 1778, 2503); ere (l. 2544).

In Juge. 759, the third person plural is found: "dont souvent les espars de ses doulz yeulz sur elle erent espars."

The imperfect subjunctive has regularly *-ions* and *-iez* in the first and second persons plural, although, according to D. & H. (§ 122), *-ons* and *-ez* were the more common endings in the sixteenth century: partissions : bussions (Poissy 349); laississions: voulsissions : yssissions : allissions (Poissy 256); veissiez (Past. 160); pensessiez : voulsissiez (Duc 2786).

Past-Definite Tense

Nyrop (II, § 169, 1) says; "Le changement purement graphique de *dormi* en *dormis*, ne s'accomplit qu'après la Renaissance. Au commencement du seizième siècle on écrit: *je senti, je dormi, je parti*, tout comme *je fu, je deu*, etc." This usage of the sixteenth century is not what might be expected from the prevalence of the *s* in the first person one hundred years before. It would seem that grammarians had had in this instance some effect upon the language. Je fus so far prevails in Christine over je fu that the latter must be considered exceptional. In Duc, je fus is found in ll. 52, 267, 294, 544, 847, 908, 1205, 1233, 1316, 1399, 1433, 1437, 1537, 1621, 1667, etc., while in these 1667 lines, je fu is found once (l. 65). So also regularly je doz = je dus (Duc 941), je dos (Duc 2509); je pos (Poissy 1667); poz (*ibid.* 1683); je sçoz (Debat 437). In the past definite of avoir, by the side of j'eus (Duc 289, 305, 574, etc.), is found, and more frequently, j'oz (Duc 720, 1070, 1460, 1465, 2400, etc., and j'os, 1056, 1596, etc.). Nyrop's note, "On trouve dans quelques verbes des traces d'une analogie inverse qui écarte la voyelle *u* (*y*): Tu oz," seems entirely inadequate to suggest the frequency of these forms at this time, not only in the first person but in all persons: tu os (Vol. III, p. 16, l. 28); ot (Rose 180); ommes (Poissy 246); eusmes (*ibid.* 899); ilz orent (Ep. 326); cf. oz = ose : oz = j'eus : loz = lots : loz < laus (Alain Chartier, "Livre des quatre dames," *Œuvres*, p. 673). In other verbs besides the above, the *s* in the first person singular of the past definite is not so regularly found. Still, in strong forms the analogical *s* prevails, and in weak forms is not at all uncommon: tins (295, 3025); vins (1073); veis (581, 841), one syl. = vis (2571, 2676); revins (3474); devins (2677); creus (2275); receus (1069, 2386); leus (2389); souffris

(2395), all in Duc; sceus (Past. 549); saillis (Past. 991); respondis (Past. 1153).

Future and Conditional Tenses

The lengthened form of the future and conditional of verbs in *-dre* is sparingly used by Christine as compared for example with Froissart. In fact only two forms have been noted: perderoit (Debat 599), perderoies (Past. 895). Froissart in the first volume of *Méliador* uses similar forms twenty-four times.

The stem of the future and conditional of avoir in Christine is regularly *ar-; avr-* is occasionally found (devray : avray, III, p. 255, l. 27), and still more rarely *aur-* (Rose 518, I, p. 100, l. 9, III, p. 170, l. 6).

IRREGULAR VERBS

A large number of verbs, irregular in O. Fr. but regular today, are found in Christine's works in the process of transformation. Where the stem-accented form finally prevailed, it is interesting to note that it was first in the future and conditional that it displaced the ending accented form. This is what might a priori be expected, the *e* of the infinitive becoming medial and mute, and a secondary accent falling on the old infinitive stem: "Je pleure" (Ep. 41) and "je pleureray" (I, p. 15, 3 times), pleurer (Poissy 948), but still plourer (Poissy 958, 998, 1038, etc.; C. 2141), plourant, (I, p. 34), plourez (I, p. 32). In Vol. III, p. 256, is the interesting rhyme pleureray : meureray = mourrai. As Christine, like Chrestien de Troyes before her, conjugates "love" in all its modes and tenses, it is the verb aimer which offers the best example of this: forms in *am-* in the future and conditional are exceptional, while I have found nowhere else *aim-* as the stem, where it does not phonetically belong. In "Le dit de la Pastoure" the following pertinent forms are found:

Et ne m'aimeras tu mie?—l. 414.

N'aimeroie.—l. 446.

Choisis un, se veulz *amer*
Et ne te fay pas blasmer
De ceulz qui d'amour legiere
Aymeroient toy, bergiere.
—l. 910.

Paris promist a s'amie
Qu'a toujours mais l'*aimeroit.*
—l. 1397.

De tant t'aimera il mains.—l. 1277.

Par quoy pluseurs grans maistresses
. . . . . .
L'aimeront. . . . .
—l. 2112.

aimeras.—ll. 937, 1272.

Cuideroies tu *amée*
Estre de lui, fole, nyce!
—l. 1283.

Que Senone moult *l'ama*
Et doulz ami le clama.
—l. 1388.

Pour poyssance que g'y eusse
M'en oster ja, tant *l'amoye.*
—l. 1492.

posé ore
Que tant ne *m'amast* encore
Comme un autre *m'aimeroit.*
—l. 1498.

Naturally the transformation of these verbs was a longer process than that of the verbs in which the stem of the ending-accented forms prevailed, these being already in the large majority.

But in the verbs prier, nier, lier, plier, priser, the greatest confusion prevails in Christine, in which the modern forms seem to have already the advantage: "Amours si fort me lie" (Vol. I, p. 27, l. 15); "Ce scevent ceulz qu'amours destraint et loie" (Debat 897); lié (p. p. Debat 1901); loyer, loier = lier (Debat 1033); lier (Poissy 1865); nyer (Vol. I, p. 134); noyer = nier (Juge. 78); prier (Vol. I, p. 180); proyer (Juge. 77); prient (Ep. 382); prioit (Past. 616); prioye (Past. 2055); but "puis qu'on m'en proie" (Vol. I, p. 2, l. 23); ploie (pr. 3, Vol. I, p. 194); je prise (Vol. I, p. 23, l. 25); proisiez (p. 236, l. 10); prisier (Vol. I, p. 266, l. 21).

Of the verbs in which the stem of the ending-accented form prevails the transformation has in Christine taken place most completely in parler, only three old forms having been found by the side of the new forms: "De tous les dieux dont Ovide parole" (Vol. I, p. 53); "A point tais et à point parole" (En. Mo. 31)

and parolle again, third person singular, in Pro. Mo. 83. Lève is found as well as lieve:

> Roÿne qui des maux nous leve
> Lesquelx nous empetra dame Eve.
> —Vol. III, p. 4.

Trouver is conjugated regularly: je trouve (Ep. 314), but je treuve is very frequently found, as might be predicted in view of Molière's use of treuve. Nyrop cites (p. 90) truis as still found in the fourteenth century, citing "Se la voie truis," from a Miracle Play of Nostre Dame. But Christine uses it "Car ne me truis de nul bien assouvy (Vol. III, p. 251, l. 3); "et ne truis nul bon repos" (Poissy 1021); "Mais je vous truis tout changé" (III, p. 293, l. 2).

A few verbs offer forms of peculiar interest: In speaking of aller, Nyrop says: "Au XVI^e^ siècle, *vois* a été remplacé par *vais*" (II, §116). Christine uses vais: "mais je me vais emblant" (Poissy 1011; *ibid.*, l. 921; Vol. I, p. 115, l. 14; p. 172; Rondeau 46, etc.). The form vois is also found: "Je m'en vois" (Vol. I, p. 163). In the third person va is the common form (Vol. I, p. 42, l. 9; p. 160, l. 3, etc.); but vait is also found, and the analogical form voit, "et que si droit s'en voit que ne chancelle" (Vol. I, p. 14, l. 9).

Although Nyrop says that the modern forms of the present subjunctive of dire appear only in the sixteenth century (§ 139, 4), it is difficult to construe disiez (Duc 2141), and dissiez (Duc 2168), dissiez (Debat 1845), for example, as anything but a present subjunctive in spite of the double *s*.

> Il a tant
> De pitié en vous, ma dame,
> Que perdre le corps et l'ame,
> Quelque chose que disiez,
> Ne croy que vous laississiez
> A cellui qui est tout vostre.
> —Duc 2138–43.
>
> Si bien m'en entremettray
> Que congneu ne sera d'omme,
> Mais que vous me dissiez comme
> Vous voulez qu'il se maintiegne,
> Et pour vous veoir se tiengne.
> —Duc 2166–70.

Quoy que dissiez, encor di et termine
Que c'est plus grant et trop parfait signe
De grant amour parfaitte et enterine
De soy fier
En ses amours que de s'en defier.
—Debat 1845–49.

Dissiez as imperfect subjunctive so early as 1402 is not without interest, for though it is more commonly written deissiez, the *e* before *i* may be silent:

. . . . quant est de moy loueroie
Que vous deissiez et voulentiers l'orroie,
Car proprement certes n'en parleroie.
—Debat 418.

Boire offers the curious form buvra:

Car ma dame la prieuse un beau mais
Nous envoya et de son bon vin, mais
De meilleur vin ne buvra homs jamais.
—Poissy 775.

Cf. buvrage (Poissy 1426: D. & H., § 31); abuvrées (En. Mo. 96).

The glide *v* appears exceptionally in forms of pouvoir: peuvent (Ep. 59; cf. pevent, Ep. 505); povoyes (Vol. I, p. 8, l. 5).

A past definite of venir and tenir, not recognized by grammarians, possibly an orthographic rather than a morphologic variant, is repeatedly used by Christine:

Vers le bois nous sommes traittes
Et loings des autres retraittes
Tant qu'a la fontaine veismes
Et sus l'erbe nous seïsmes.
—Past. 978.

Cf. venimes (Poissy 699); venismes (Past. 1202).

Courir is already used by Christine as Vaugelas would have required (Nyrop II, § 77, 1):

Quant je ouÿ la voix courir
Que ma belle dame amoye,
Si engreiga plus la moye
Doleur, etc. —Duc 1457.

corsi = courut (Debat 679), is also noteworthy; escripre = écrire has an imperfect, escrisoit (Juge. 886; cf. Nyrop II, § 46, 1 R.).

LUCY M. GAY
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

GUIRAUT RIQUIER AND THE VISCOUNT OF NARBONNE

In the poem "Anc non aigui nulh temps de far chanso Mellor razo" (No. XIV of Pfaff's edition in Mahn's *Werke der Troubadours*), Guiraut Riquier, after expressing in the first stanza his joy at finding a new protector, says:

> Qu'ieu ai servit de lauzor non sai quo
> Tal qu'anc nom fo
> Amicx de dreg en dreg,
> Ni m'o promes; mas quar lo vi adreg,
> Volguil servir per tal, quem fos honors
> Sos guazardos, et a so leu passat.

Of whom is the poet speaking? To which one of the nobles whom Riquier up to this time had "servit de lauzor" can this veiled complaint refer? The poem is dated 1266. Of Riquier's protectors before this date we may safely leave out of account Bertran d'Opian and Bernard d'Olargues and we are then reduced to a choice between the viscount of Narbonne, the king of Aragon, and the king of Castile. In his recent interesting study of the life and work of the poet[1] M. Anglade does not find the choice difficult. He says (p. 53):

> L'allusion est obscure. Il ne saurait être question du vicomte de Narbonne; nous verrons dans un moment pourquoi. Songe-t-il au roi d'Aragon qui ne lui a rien donné en échange de ses chants? Mais alors comment expliquer le vers: *Qu'ieu ai servit de lauzor non sais quo . . . .* ? La tenson ne contenait rien à l'éloge du roi d'Aragon, bien au contraire. Se repent-il déjà des louanges qu'il a adressées au roi de Castille l'année précédente? Cette dernière hypothèse paraît la plus probable. Le troubadour l'a servi en faisant son éloge (*de lauzor*); ce seigneur n'est pas son ami légitime, pour ainsi dire, et ne lui a pas promis de l'être. Ses belles qualités l'ont frappé; il a cru tirer quelque profit de son amitié, mais ce désir a vite passé. Riquier, heureux d'avoir trouvé un nouveau protecteur, s'excuse du mieux qu'il peut d'avoir adressé ailleurs ses flatteries; il est assez habile, dans cette obscurité voulue, pour qu'on ne puisse pas lui reprocher ses vers; il ne s'est pas compromis.

[1] Joseph Anglade *Le Troubadour Guiraut Riquier, étude sur la décadence de l'ancienne poésie provençale* (Bordeaux-Paris, 1905).

This decision seems to me by no means sure and final, and since the question bears upon the whole subject of the relation of the poet to the court of Narbonne it deserves a somewhat more careful consideration. The argument for the king of Castile hardly seems a strong one. It is true that in the preceding year the poet praised King Alphonse, but what was the character of his praise? In the lines quoted above, Riquier seems to be speaking of one whom he has praised for valiant deeds and worldly success. In the poem of the preceding year (1265) after long complaint of the neglect of his poetry, he says:

Lay, on es atendutz
Sabers e car tengutz,
M'en yrai dreytamens
E serai ereubutz,
Al rey, on es vertutz,
Castellan d'onramens
Qu'elh es lutz resplandens
Per totz bes dir e far
E per pretz restaurar.
Agra ops, qu'enans fos,
Per que a nom N Anfos.

And in the preceding stanza he uses the expression "un dels conoyssens." In this *chanson* the poet seems chiefly to have in mind the king's appreciation of poetry, and he would hardly make excuse for, or regret, praise of this sort for one whose protection of troubadours was already proverbial. Perhaps Riquier has in mind the praise bestowed on the king in his letter to the viscount's son. Yet praise thus given in a letter to young Amalric, then at the king's court, would scarcely be made the subject of special regret a year later and at the very moment of finding a new protector. Why excuse himself at all for praise bestowed but twice? And why make the allusion obscure if it referred to King Alphonse? Moreover, but two years later, possibly much less, for we have the dates only by years, in the epistle of 1268, once more to the viscount's son, Riquier repeats his praise of King Alphonse, and yet we have no evidence of any favor received nor does he express any hope of such favor. The poet's words seem to imply something

more than this—a praise more often repeated and long continued—and to contain not a mere excuse but the bitterness of deceived hope.

It is true that Riquier says "et a so leu passat," which M. Anglade translates "mais ceci a vite passé," making *so* the subject of *a passat*, and its antecedent the desire expressed in *volgui*. This translation naturally reduces the whole passage to a mere excuse. But there is another possible translation which seems to me the correct one. That is to make *so* the *object* of *a passat* and the unexpressed subject the person of whom the poet is speaking. The translation would then read, "But he has lightly disregarded this (praise)." For similar meanings of passar cf.:

Car qui so qu'el commanda
Passa, non es valens.
—Riquier (Mahn), p. 126, ll. 38, 39.

Que hom no passe res
De so qu'elha essenha.
—P. 126, ll. 42, 43.

Pero si non pot als
E passa son conven.
—P. 120, ll. 134, 135.

Cf. also Jaufre, *Appel. Ch.*, No. 3, ll. 466, 467; Peire Cardenal Bart, Ch. 191, 11, 12; Elias de Barjols (ed. Stronski) II, 31.

The passage thus ceases to be a mere excuse for a single song or letter of praise for King Alphonse, and seems rather the bitterness of a long sorrow for wasted effort and neglected talent, finding natural expression at the moment when the future seems to brighten.

When M. Anglade says: "Il ne saurait être question du vicomte de Narbonne; nous verrons dans un moment pourquoi," he appears to mean that the new protector from whom Riquier hopes so much is Guillem d'Anduze, brother of the viscount's wife, and perhaps that the poet closes the song with the two lines:

Narbonam plai, quar porta bon'amor
E bon fe a son hourat senhor.

Rather than to see in these facts the impossibility of a reference to the viscount in the second stanza, have we not here the reason for the obscurity of that reference? To make doubly sure of

giving no offense the poet adds once more—the first time in two years—the formal mention of the viscount, an absolutely colorless expression, the most formal of all his allusions to Amalric.

If we examine the relations of Riquier with the viscount of Narbonne we shall find, I think, that the words of the song under discussion describe the relation up to this time with surprising accuracy. We are reduced for our data to the rather meager information given in the envoys of the songs and to the general tone of these songs and of the letters. It might be said in passing that, judged merely by quantity, when we remember that it covers a stretch of twelve years, the praise bestowed on the viscount can hardly be called enthusiastic. The quality of this praise is still more striking. M. Anglade has remarked upon its formal character—reduced some times to a couple of perfunctory lines—and has shown that in all probability in several instances Riquier was moved to write it by some political event. But while recognizing these facts M. Anglade seems to have assumed a closeness of relation and friendship between the viscount and the poet which goes beyond the evidence unless we read a great deal too much between the lines. To make this clear we will review rapidly the poet's mention of his lord.

The first song (1254) does not mention the viscount, but is dedicated to Bernart d'Olargue and Bertran d'Opian. In 1255 we have, as the envoy of a song complaining that Love has lost his followers and that men no longer understand and value worth, the following:

> N'Amalricx, on es valors,
> No vol quel tortz vas luy penda,
> Que tant gent s'es mes el cors
> Qu'ab cobetat ten contenda;
> E fora sai pretz peritz,
> Mas en elh s'es afortitz
> Ab joy, per que vin houratz
> Vescoms Narbones amatz.

The praise here is most general and formal, and contains nothing of personal warmth. Of the poem of 1256 M. Anglade himself says: "C'est ainsi que la troisième chanson se termine par un

éloge du vicomte Amalric aussi vague et aussi banal que le premier. . . . . Il semble bien que cette fois-ci l'éloge soit une allusion à un événement réel." In 1257 Riquier is more productive and we have two *chansons* and an *alba.* The *chansons* are dedicated, one to the viscount and Bertran d'Opian, the other to the viscount alone. The praise in the latter consists of two lines:

L'onrat senhor de Narbona per ver
Pot hom lauzar a dreg, tan sap valer.

The other is more interesting:

L'onratz vescoms cuy iorns ni sers
Non tolh que valors non l'essenh
A far faitz de belh entressenh,
N'Amalricx s'es a bon pretz ders
Ab bon grat dels pus prezans,
Tant quels croys ten en balans,
Et es senhers de Narbona plazens
Per quel lauzi, pero pus es valens.

Here Riquier tells us definitely that he praises the viscount because he accomplishes glorious deeds and is "valens"—a rather striking similarity to

Mas quar lo vi adreg,
Volguil servir per tal, quem fos honors
Sos guazardos.

In 1258 the praise is equally lacking in warmth and refers evidently to some historical event.

L'onratz senhers de Narbona gazanha
Grat et amor, son verai pretz creyssen,
De sos vezis e de la gent estranha.

In 1259 we read:

Al vescomte N'Amalric de Narbona
Vir, ma chanson; quar tot vil fag azira
E manten pretz, per que valors li sobra,
Tant quels vils ricx de mals pessamens carga
E manten joy e gab senes messonia
Ab grat dels pros senes tota traversa
E sap valer tant, quels estranhs taborna
Salvan s'onor, per que irals escoria.

Here we must agree with M. Anglade that the poet refers to some historical event of which we have no record. The lines cer-

tainly contain no evidence that the viscount had shown the poet any special favor. Moreover, in this year Riquier is seeking favor elsewhere. To this year belongs the letter to the viscountess of Lautrec, and one is tempted to contrast the elaborate praise of this letter with the stilted references to the viscount of Narbonne, and to see something more than idle words—a suggestion of literary conscience—in the opening lines.

Qui a sen et entendemen
E saber e conoisemen
E vol despendre sos bels ditz
Per so que sia pus grazitz,
Deu gardar de qui parlara,
Si dira ver o mentira,
Car massa lauzor es blasmars
E trop bes dirs es mal estars.
Si sel de quis ditz non es tals,
Tot lo be, c'om ditz, es mals.

Certainly Riquier cannot be accused of "trop bes dirs" of the viscount of Narbonne.

In 1260 the only reference to the viscount is:

Narbona vey enantir
El guay senhor plazentier
Cuy dieus gart de dan e d'ira.

The song of which this is the envoy shows a state of depression and unhappiness, and the pastoral of the same year expresses the same mood and finds hope of relief not in the viscount but in Bertran d'Opian.

Toza, tot m'afara
May N Bertrans m'ampara
D'Opian l'entier.

The envoy of the song of 1261 does not differ materially from the preceding ones and seems also to owe its impulse to some political event.

Vers, quant seras apres, vay
Al pro Amalric prezat,
Vescomte de Narbones,
Qu'elh a bon pretz gazanhat
El mante entier ses notz,
Don tug sey amic son leth
Els autres ab cossirier.

The *descort* of the same year complains of Belh Deport and says,

E servirai lieys el don d'Opian.

The pastoral of 1262 mentions no protector and the song dated in one MS 1262, in the other 1260, speaks of the viscount in the usual conventional fashion:

Senh'En vescoms N'Amalricx, mantenensa
Donatz a pretz, per queus te noblamens
De Narbona senhor e de las gens
Ab grat del mielhs del mon et ab temensa.

In 1263 we have a song to the Virgin, a *serena*, and a song dedicated to the viscount. The first two give us no information and the mention of the viscount in the last has the colorless character as to personal warmth of those of preceding years but is interesting as containing a warning note:

L'onrat senhor de Narbona
N'Amalric, que pretz mante
Prec, quel guar si, quos cove,
E viura plazens, lials
Estranhatz de totz ditz mals.

"Il y a là," says M. Anglade, "un conseil qui semble bien faire allusion à un événement de l'histoire Narbonnaise." Just what this event was we need not discuss; the fact to note is that the reference to the viscount has its inspiration once more in some historical happening not in any generosity on the part of the viscount toward the poet. It should also be emphasized that, with the exception of the song under discussion (1266), this is the last mention of the viscount until the letter "Sim fos saber grazitz" of 1269, where the poet becomes reconciled with someone whose name he does not mention but who would seem to be the viscount. The poem of 1263 with its warning against "totz ditz mals" should, it seems to me, be considered in relation with the letter, and the causes of the estrangement mentioned in this letter should be sought, not necessarily in the year when the letter was written, but possibly as far back as 1263.

In 1264 Riquier wrote only the third pastoral—at least nothing else is preserved to us from that year—a silence that may be considered as significant of no warm affection for the viscount and as

indicating that during that year the poet was the recipient of no favors. M. Anglade explains this silence by supposing the poet absent from Narbonne—an unnecessary supposition. Why not assume that the silence is due to strained relations with the viscount? M. Anglade himself suggests reasons for believing this when he says: "Quoiqu'il en soit, il semble qu'il y ait eu des raisons particulières qui aient contribué a lui rendre son séjour à Narbonne peu agréeable. La onzième chanson (1265) est une longue plainte dirigée d'abord contre l'amour, puis remplie d'allusions obscures et terminée par un cri d'espoir." The allusions are obscure as far as their particular reference is concerned, but the general import is clear. The poet is angered that his poetry is not appreciated while insignificant poets receive recognition:

Er serai mal volgutz,
Blasmatz e vil tengutz
Per pecx, qu'om fa sabens;
Don belhs vers es vencutz
E vils mentirs cregutz.
Pero non suy temens;
Quar us dels conoyssens
Me pot mais yssaussar
Que cent pec abaissar;
E quar ma sospeyssos
Es en luec tan joyos.

He then tells us that he shall go to King Alphonse and that it is he who shall understand and appreciate him:

Nom pot esser guirens
Totz l'autre mons, som par,
Ni m'en cal laguiar,
Sil reys, cuy es leos,
Nom restaura ioys.

The mood expressed in this song makes it unnecessary to assume an absence from Narbonne to explain Riquier's silence in the preceding year. He has come to realize the truth,

Qu'ieu servit de lauzor non sai quo
Tal qu'anc nom fo
Amics de dreg en dreg.

To this same year belongs the letter to the viscount's son, asking him to recommend the poet to the king of Castile at whose court

the young man was then stopping, and possibly also the *tenson* with Guilhem de Mur seeking favor with the king of Aragon. We have nowhere any mention of the viscount unless it be the veiled and derogatory allusions in the song mentioned above.

We now come to the year (1266) of the poem which raises the question with which we opened this discussion, the year, too, in which Riquier writes to his friend Rofian a letter full of genuiue grief and containing the words,

Car soi tot sol sai,
E prec vos que, sieus plai,
Me detz calque cofort
Per letras.

Here we may quote the words of M. Anglade (p. 37): "Nous connaissons maintenant les thèmes que Riquier développe dans ses envois: la force et la vaillance du vicomte, son amour des belles actions et la protection qu'il accorde au talent." The last phrase, however, we should feel constrained to omit. Where does Riquier tell us that the viscount gives protection to talent? The whole tone of his poetry during this period contradicts the statement. In brief the matter seems to me to lie thus: Riquier is a citizen of Narbonne, perhaps bound to his native city by ties of which we know nothing and which make him reluctant to seek his fortune elsewhere and at a distance. As a citizen of Narbonne he owes his fealty to the viscount, who is loved and respected by his subjects. In 1255 Riquier begins to praise him for his power and valiant deeds, especially when some event which pleases his subjects gives the poet a particular impulse. He sings his love for the viscountess (if Belh Deport really was the viscountess[1]) and continues his formal praise of the viscount until 1264, ever hoping for that favor which was given to troubadours at the court of Narbonne in former times, and which Riquier knew as given still at the court of Castile. When opportunity offers he seeks connection elsewhere but seems ever reluctant to leave Narbonne. In 1264 he ceases his praise. Neither Belh Deport nor the viscount has ever shown him any particular generosity. He is discouraged and bitter, yet policy, so long as he must continue

[1] Cf. Savj-Lopez, "L' ultimo trovatore," *Trovatori e Poeti*, 1906.

to live at Narbonne, forbids any but the vaguest expression of his feeling. In 1266 a new opportunity presents itself. He believes that he has a new protector, that he is at last to leave Narbonne and while voicing his joy he cannot forget his long despised praise of another and the failure of his dearest hopes, and he gives his grief expression. But his new protector is the brother of the viscountess; he must be cautious; his allusion is therefore vague and to increase his security he adds two lines of the coldest and most formal praise of the viscount. Riquier's relations with the court of Narbonne were never, in our opinion, close enough to justify the expression "poète salarié."

In the later work of the poet there seems to be nothing that would compel a modification of this view of the case. The viscount of Narbonne died in December, 1270. Between 1266 and this date when Riquier wrote a *planh* in his honor, we have no direct and certain mention of him. It is true that earlier in the year 1270 we have the letter to "N Amalric de Narbonne a Tunis," which M. Anglade seems convinced was written to the father and not to the son. The ground for this certainty I do not quite see. The tone of the letter is such as would be more appropriate if it were addressed to the younger man; it is similar in tone to the other letters written to the young Amalric. To assume the father as the object involves us in a historical difficulty in that the father's name is not among the names of those who took part in the crusade and there is strong proof that he was in Narbonne but a short time after the date when the letter was written. To meet this difficulty M. Anglade is forced to assume that the viscount started on the crusade but for some unknown reason did not sail with the others and returned to Narbonne. Since there is nothing in the letter that might not apply to the young Amalric it seems simpler to assume that the letter was written to him.

In the letter of the preceding year (1269) Riquier, after discussion of the different kinds of *vergonha*, in a rather long digression makes an application of his doctrine to the case of some friend from whom he has been estranged and who has asked him to show him his fault. No names are mentioned, and, while his description seems to fit the viscount better than anyone else of

whom we know, it is by no means certain that he is the friend in question. We may, however, grant that this friend is the viscount, and that the letter written after this reconciliation was addressed to him rather than to his son without prejudice to our main contention, that the relation of Riquier to the viscount of Narbonne was rather that of the loyal subject than of the "poète salarié," that for a considerable stretch of years this relation was strained, and that the words of the song of 1266 are meant to apply to the viscount. The *planh* of 1270, when we consider the conventional character of this form of poetry, can hardly be offered in objection. The poet might have written such a conventional song of mourning for one with whom he had had but incidental relation.

I. C. LECOMPTE

YALE UNIVERSITY

SOME PARALLELS TO *BARTHOLOMEW FAIR*

The opinion seems generally current that Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair* is entirely original.[1] I think, however, it can be shown that for his plot Jonson took suggestions from at least one other play, and that he made free use of the literature of roguery. The comic retribution that overtakes Waspe after he has ridiculed Bartholomew Cokes for the loss of two purses was more than probably suggested by the old play of *Sir Thomas More*, and Jonson apparently drew from the same source for his treatment of the cutpurse scenes. Moreover, many of the jest books, lives of rogues, pamphlets on coney-catching, and miscellaneous tracts of Jonson's day illustrate *Bartholomew Fair* and often furnish rather close parallels, so that there is little doubt that Jonson, though the stage-keeper's charge that he did not "hit the humours" of the fair[2] is hardly just, owed as much to his vast reading in every field as to his own invention or to his knowledge of the fair. It is only in this play of *Sir Thomas More*, however, that I have found a main motive and situation of *Bartholomew Fair* combined with many of its details.

The fact that *Sir Thomas More* was not published till 1844 gives rise to the question whether Jonson knew the play. *Bartholomew Fair* itself furnishes the best evidence that he did. There is also probably a hint of *Sir Thomas More* in *The Silent Woman* when Morose, seeing Mrs. Otter beating Otter, exclaims:

> Mistress Mary Ambree, your examples are dangerous. Rogues, hell-hounds, Stentors! out of my doors, you sons of noise and tumult, begot on an ill May-day.[3]

Gifford takes this to refer to the London riots of May-day, 1517, which are celebrated in the play of *Sir Thomas More* and in a

[1] Cf. Ward, *Hist. of Eng. Dram. Lit.*, Vol. II, p. 370, and Koeppel, *Quellen-Studien zu den Dramen B. J.*, etc., p. 14.

[2] *B. F.* Induction, *Jonson's Works*, Vol. II, p. 143. References to Jonson's works are to the Gifford-Cunningham three-volume edition (London, 1904). *Bartholomew Fair* is in the second volume, pp. 141–210. References to *Sir Thomas More* are by page to Dyce's edition for the Shakespeare Society (London, 1844).

[3] *Sil. Wom.*, IV, 1, *Works*, I, 438.

ballad, "The Story of Ill May-Day." If, as is probable, Morose's expression, "ill May-day," involves not merely a hostile attitude to May-day but a reference to the London riots, Jonson doubtless had in mind the play and not the ballad or historical accounts; for one of the leaders of the May-day riots, appearing in the play and not elsewhere, is Doll Williamson, a fighting woman of the same type as Mary Ambree. For the fictitious Doll, Jonson might not unnaturally have substituted a name well known to his hearers and celebrated elsewhere in his work. Negatively, the date of *Sir Thomas More* was not so early nor its probable popularity so slight as to be evidence against Jonson's knowledge of the play. From internal evidence conclusions have been drawn placing the date of the play around 1590 or as late as 1595 in parts.[1] The cutpurse scenes, which evidently belong to the older part of the play, are based on the incident given, apparently for the first time, in the earliest published life of More, that of Stapleton's *Tres Thomae*, 1588. Moreover, parts of the play belong to so advanced a stage in the development of the drama that some good critics have judged them to be the work of Shakespeare.[2] Furthermore, the revision, the occurrence of an actor's name in the manuscript,[3] and the elaborate changes made by Tyllney, Master of the Revels (1579–1610), for performance, emphasize the connection of the play with the stage.

The part of *Sir Thomas More* that has the elements of Jonson's cutpurse scenes is the second scene according to Dyce's edition, a short one covering pp. 6–13. *Bartholomew Fair* offers a parallel to nearly every detail, and, while some of the parallels

[1] Dyce, *Sir Th. M.*, Preface; Simpson, 4 *N. and Q.*, VIII, 1 ff.; Fleay, *Biog. Chron. Eng. Drama*, II, p. 312, and *Life and Work of Sh.*, pp. 27, 127, 292, 293; Schelling, *Eng. Chron. Play*, p. 211. The determination of the date of *Sir Thomas More* would possibly have some bearing on the source of the mob scenes in *The First Part of the Contention*, in *2 Henry VI*, and in *Julius Caesar*. The attitude of the mob at first in *Sir Thomas More*, the indication of veering in the midst of More's arguments, the complete turn of the mob at the end, the genuine oratorical tone of More's speech, the sharp contrast between this and the talk of the leaders of the mob, and many details in language are similar to *Julius Caesar* especially. (See Simpson's article and compare *Sir Th. M.*, p. 29, ll. 6, 7, and *Jul. Caes.*, III, 1, ll. 271–74, etc.)

[2] Ward, *Hist. Eng. Dram. Lit.*, II, pp. 214, 215; Simpson, 4 *N. and Q.*, VIII, pp. 1 ff.; Spedding, 4 *N. and Q.*, X, pp. 227 f.

[3] *Sir Th. M.*, p. 53, n. 1. The same name occurs in the plot of Tarlton's *Seven Deadly Sins* (Collier, *Hist. Eng. Dram. Poetry and Stage* [1879], III, pp. 198 ff.); see Fleay, *Life and Work of Sh.*, pp. 23, 264–66, 296. Cf. *Sir Th. M.*, p. 59, n. 3, for another name preserved in the play.

are very slight or commonplace, I have mentioned them all, giving the passages that are most closely akin.

1. The scene in *Sir Thomas More* opens with a censure not of the cutpurse but of his victim. Sir Thomas More, the Lord Mayor, Suresbie, and other justices are trying the case of Lifter for cutting the purse of Smart. Suresbie, obtaining leave to speak, delivers a severe lecture to Smart. This situation occurs twice in *Bartholomew Fair*. When Cokes loses his first purse, Waspe cries out:

> Are you not justly served, in your conscience now, speak in your conscience?[1]

and at the loss of the second purse, Waspe turns upon Cokes with a still severer censure:

> You are an ass, sir, ... they are such retchless flies as you are, that blow cut-purses abroad in every corner; your foolish having of money makes them.[2]

"Justly served" of Waspe's first attack may be compared with the only phrase preserved in an imperfect line at the end of Suresbie's speech, "rightlie seru'de." The wording of the second attack is similar to that in the preceding part of Suresbie's censure:

> . . . . Thou art a foolish fellowe.
> . . . . . .
> What makes so many pilferers and fellons,
> But such fond baites that foolish people lay
> To tempt the needie miserable wretche?[3]

2. In the plan that is laid in both plays to bring the censure home to the censurer, the same details come out.

After Suresbie's rebuke of Smart, More, obtaining his whispered request from the Lord Mayor, sends out all but Lifter, whose life he then offers to save on the condition that he repeat his performance by cutting Suresbie's purse. More overcomes Lifter's distrust and fear of the consequences by revealing a secret knowledge of some of Lifter's past crimes, and thus makes his life doubly the reward of success in the jest. Lifter consents, boasting of his ability to accomplish the robbery, and he is com-

[1] *B. F.*, II, 1, *Works*, II, 169. [2] *B. F.*, III, 1, *Works*, II, 179. [3] *Sir Th. M.*, pp. 6, 7.

manded to bring the purse to More. In *Bartholomew Fair*, as Waspe and Cokes leave the scene of the second robbery, Quarlous, who is left with the cutpurse Edgworth as More was with Lifter, calls Edgworth and imposes upon him the task of robbing Waspe of a box taken from Cokes for safekeeping. Quarlous has seen Edgworth rob Cokes of his purse and uses the knowledge to make him consent, promising as a reward for his success not to betray him. Edgworth, boasting of his skill, offers to bring only the contents of the box and is told to do so.

3. In the downfall of the overconfident man, who seeks his troubles and runs into the toils, there is also a likeness in the two plays.

To Suresbie, who is sent in by More after Lifter has consented to cut his purse, Lifter makes a declaration of his own innocence, and then he proceeds to tell of the tricks of more skilful cutpurses than himself. One statement of his ought to put Suresbie on guard, but he is so bent on knowing the tricks of cutpurses in order to catch the rogues that he is blind to the situation. He longs to know the tricks of the trade, and in an aside Lifter promises him his desire. Through this self-confidence and eagerness to match the cutpurses, he permits Lifter to draw him on, and runs into the toils, losing his purse even while he is boasting of his ability to keep it. This incident is worked into the robbery of both Waspe and Cokes, but it is more fully elaborated in the case of Cokes, appearing in all of its details. There Nightingale, coming in to rob Cokes a second time,[1] tells Cokes that he sings his "Caveat against Cut-purses" that he may be held guiltless if a purse is cut in his presence. This suggests Lifter's declaration of innocence as a prelude to a well-planned robbery. When Nightingale sings his song, telling, as Lifter tells Suresbie, of the deeds of the cutpurses and of their boldness, Cokes like Suresbie is deceived and led on, rather than warned. Then comes the desire of Cokes, which is ironically fulfilled, to pit himself against the cutpurses.

A comparison of language shows to what extent the "humours" of the characters correspond. Suresbie's eagerness comes out in

[1] *B. F.*, III, 1, *Works*, II, 176.

his questions about the cutpurses, which follow Lifter's description of their tricks:

> Tell me what are they? where they may be caught?
> I, those are they I looke for.

Then Lifter promises:

> And you shall haue your longing ere ye goe.[1]

Suresbie's remark just before he discovers that he has already been robbed is:

> But let them gull me, widgen me, rooke me, foppe me,
> Yfaith, yfaith, they are too short for me.
> Knaues and fooles meete when pursses goe;
> Wise men looke to their pursses well enough.[2]

So Cokes calls for the cutpurses again and again until he gets his desire. After the loss of his first purse, he shows another and says:

> Let him catch this that catch can. I would fain see him get this, look you here.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> I will put it just where the other was, and if we have good luck, you shall see a delicate fine trap to catch the cut-purse nibbling.

Edgworth overhears and promises as Lifter did:

> Faith, and he'll try ere you be out o' the Fair.[3]

Nightingale's song recalls Cokes to his desire and makes it only the more insistent. He prays Nightingale to raise him one or two. As Nightingale sings, "Look to your purses," Cokes cries, "Ha, ha, this chimes! Good counsel at first dash;" and when Nightingale comes to "beware of the cut-purse so bold," Cokes echoes his previous remark, "Well said! he were to blame that would not, i' faith." Holding his hand on his purse, Cokes reiterates his desire, and at last breaks out:

> A pox on them, that they will not come! that a man should have such a desire to a thing, and want it!

Especially in view of the fact that the audience knows of the cutpurse's determination to gull the boaster, Jonson's prolonged preparation for the climax must have made this part of *Bartholomew Fair* much more entertaining than the original, where the dare of

[1] *Sir Th. M.*, p. 10. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 11. [3] *B. F.*, II, 1, *Works*, II, 169, 170.

the cocksure justice, the acceptance by the cutpurse, and the downfall follow each other too rapidly for the tension of expectancy to reach its keenest point. A remark of Quarlous, much in the spirit of Lifter's and Edgworth's promises, indicates the eagerness that the scene in *Bartholomew Fair* produces with the spectators, and prepares for the success of the cutpurse and for his acceptance as a comic hero. "'Fore God," Quarlous declares, "I'd give half the Fair, an 'twere mine, for a cut-purse for him, to save his longing." Then Cokes, flourishing his purse once more and putting it up, exclaims ironically, "I am an ass, I cannot keep my purse!" and is robbed the next moment,[1] as Suresbie was robbed at the climax of his self-confidence. In working up the robbery of Waspe, Jonson has used only the same motive, omitting many details and changing others. The same humor, however, that Suresbie shows when he declares that only fools lose purses, leads Waspe to say, as he takes the box away from Cokes after Cokes's second loss:[2]

But give me this from you in the meantime; I beseech you, see if I can look to this,

and immediately after,

Why! because you are an ass.[3]

4. In the two plays the discovery of the loss is made in the same way.

Suresbie finds his purse missing when, in response to a suggestion of More's, he is about to make a contribution to the funeral

[1] *B. F.*, II, 1, *Works*, 176, 178.

[2] In the "Merry Frolicks or the Comical Cheats of Swalpo," etc. (Ashton, *Chap-books of the Eighteenth Century*, pp. 337 ff.) there is an account of a pickpocket who, performing set tasks, picks a nobleman's pocket of a watch carefully guarded, by tickling him under the ear, as Cokes is robbed in *Bartholomew Fair* the second time. The preceding task of Swalpo had been to steal the coat off the nobleman's back. Compare Cokes's loss of his coat in the third robbery. In another work, also published after Jonson's play, *Bartholomew Faire, or Variety of fancies*, etc., 1641 (reprinted in Ashbee's *Fac-simile Reprints*, No. 1, and in Hindley's *Old Book Coll. Misc.*, Vol. III) we have an exact description of this third robbery of Cokes. The passage reads: "Some of your cutpurses are in fee with cheating costermongers, who have a trick now and then to throw downe a basket of refuge peares, which prove cloake-peares to those that shall loose their hats or cloaks in striving who shall gather fastest" (p. 4). Besides, there is in the same pamphlet an account of a Puritan who attacks the pictures of Christ and his disciples and is put in the stocks, and a fairly exact copy of Ursula and Mooncalf: "In the pig-market, alias Pasty-nooke or Pye corner, ... pigges are al houres of the day on the stalls piping hot . . . . the fat greasy H[o]stesse instructs Nick Froth her tapster, to aske a shilling more for a pigs head of a woman big with child, in regard of her longing," etc. (p. 5).

[3] *B. F.*, III, 1, *Works*, II, 179.

expenses of the condemned prisoners, including Lifter, who has robbed him. Cokes, too, discovers his loss upon the moment of paying the money for the ballads to Nightingale, who has helped rob him. Each cries out with the same surprise, "My purse is gone." When Lifter is questioned by Suresbie, he says,

> Suspect ye me, sir? Oh, what a world is this!

And More, continuing the jest, says:

> But that the poore man is a prisoner,
> It would be now suspected that he had it.[1]

So Nightingale seems inclined to play upon the victim when he says to Cokes, who has just discovered his second loss, "I hope you suspect not me, sir?" Edgworth adds, much in the vein of More but with the intention of hurrying Nightingale away with the purse, which has been turned over to him:

> Thee! that were a jest indeed! dost thou think the gentleman is foolish? where hadst thou hands, I pray thee? Away, ass, away![2]

5. In the moral that is brought home to the censurer the plays agree.

When Suresbie discovers the loss of his purse, More censures him in exactly the same words that he himself had used in condemning Smart for tempting the cutpurses, and the Lord Mayor adds:

> Beleeue me, Master Suresbie, this is straunge,
> You, beeing a man so setled in assuraunce,
> Will fall in that which you condemnd in other.[3]

[1] *Sir Th. M.*, p. 12.

[2] *B. F.*, III, 1, *Works*, II, 179; *Mery Tales and Quicke Answeres* (ed. Hazlitt), No. XCV, "Of him that desired to be set vpon the pillori," gives a close parallel to this. A cutpurse asks of a bailiff the privilege of being the first put in a new pillory. After his two companions are leaving with a rich harvest reaped from the crowd that gathers, he asks to be released. "The baylie sayde to hym: by my faythe, thou arte a good felowe . . . . holde I wyll gyue the a grote to drynke, and so putte his hande in the hole of his apron. But there he founde neuer a penye. Cockes armes! (quod the bayllye) my pourse is pycked, and my moneye is gone. Syr (quod the felowe), I truste ye wyll beare me recorde, that I haue hit nat. No, by the masse, quod he, thou were on the pyllorie the whyle. Than, no force, quod the felow, and wente his waye." The same tale comes in *Pasquil's Jests* (Hazlitt, pp. 19-21) with practically the same wording except that one speech reads: "I hope (quoth the fellow) you do not think that I haue it." The comic motive of reaching for a lost purse to get money for one of the robbers, who is able to declare his own innocence boldly, occurs in Whetstone's *Promos and Cassandra*, Part I, V, 5.

[3] *Sir Th. M.*, pp. 12, 13.

Jonson makes Waspe pass this same condemnation upon himself on his return to Cokes after his release from the stocks: "He that will correct another must want fault in himself."[1] The discovery immediately after of his own loss at the hands of the cutpurses puts Waspe for once completely "out of his humour" of censure. It is in the case of Overdo, however, the officious and overweening justice of *Bartholomew Fair*, that we find the use of a man's own words to condemn him. Mrs. Overdo says of him when he is stopped in his disguise and suspected at the second robbery of Cokes,

I see he is a lewd and pernicious enormity, as Master Overdo calls him.

Overdo says in an aside,

Mine own words turned upon me like swords.[2]

6. In the third stanza of the ballad which Nightingale sings in *Bartholomew Fair* there is almost certainly a reference to the unusual purse-cutting incident dramatized in *Sir Thomas More*.[3]

Nay, once from the seat
Of judgment so great,
A judge there did lose a fair pouch of velvéte.[4]

Of his four references in the ballad to specific cases of purse-cutting, Jonson throws this one back into the realm of story or chronicle by his "once," and then gives place and circumstance for the other three. Moreover, this anecdote of More had a very wide circulation under his name.[5] In spite of Stapleton's known care in getting first-hand information,[6] its authenticity may be questioned, for Roper does not give it, and there was a strong

[1] *B. F.*, V, 3, *Works*, II, 201. [2] *B. F.*, III, 1, *Works*, II, 179.

[3] Besides the incident of *Sir Thomas More*, the only Elizabethan parallel that I know to these instances of purse-cutting in law courts given by Jonson is found in Dekker's *Iests to Make You Merrie* (1607), where the story is told of an honest juror who had his pocket picked by a cutpurse whose acquittal he had just secured (Dekker, *Non.-Dram. Works*, ed. Grosart, II, p. 311).

[4] *B. F.*, III, 1, *Works*, II, 177.

[5] It is given in Stapleton's *Tres Thomae* (1588); the life of More by B. R. (1599) in Wordsworth's *Eccl. Biog.*, Vol. II; the *Life* by Cresacre More in Jonson's lifetime; Hoddesdon's *Life* (1652); Winstanley's *England's Worthies* (1660); *Witty Apothegms delivered at Several Times and upon Several Occasions by King James, King Charls, the Marquess of Worcester, Francis Lord Bacon, and Sir Thomas Moor* (1669); quoted in Ashton's *Humour, Wit, and Satire of the Seventeenth Century*, p. 141.

[6] Bridgett, *Life and Works of Sir Thomas More*, pp. ix, x,

tendency in the sixteenth century, and even later, to create a cycle of jests around the name of More;[1] but whatever its source, it seems to have been regarded about the time *Sir Thomas More* was written and throughout Jonson's life as an authentic anecdote of More and not to have been connected with the name of any other.

The free borrowing of songs in Elizabethan dramas and the circulation of this ballad anonymously[2] later may throw doubt on Jonson's authorship of it. Nightingale, however, declares that the ballad is "a spell . . . . spick and span new," and this is verified by the allusion in the fourth stanza:

> Nay, one without grace.
> At a [far] better place
> At court, and in Christmas, before the king's face.

We have here the story of Selman, who cut a purse in the King's Chapel at Whitehall on Christmas day, 1611, and was executed within two weeks. On the day of the execution Archer entered at the Stationers' his account of Selman,[3] and this was published soon after with the title: *The Araignment of John Selman, who was executed neere Charing-Crosse the 7. of January, 1612, for a fellony by him committed in the King's Chappell at White-Hall upon Christmas day last, in presence of the King and divers of the nobility;* London, 1612. According to the account of Selman's trial, Sir Francis Bacon in condemning the prisoner said: ". . . .

[1] Chaps. xii and xiii of Stapleton's *Tres Thomae*, are filled with apothegms and anecdotes. Pp. 98–108 of B. R.'s *Life* in Wordsworth's *Eccl. Biog.*, Vol. II, are a veritable jest-book, and of the stories there given at least two occur in jest-books, that of More's treatment of a man who advertised for a lost purse in *Mery Tales and Quicke Answeres*, XV (ed. Hazlitt), and that of choosing the smallest woman as the smallest evil (also in Stapleton, chap. xiii) in *A C Mery Talys*, LXIII (ed. Oesterley). All the early lives repeat some anecdotes besides that of the cutpurse which are of doubtful authenticity. Moreover, there are scattering references to More in jest-books, as to More's servants in *XII Mery Jests of the Wyddow Edyth*. Cf. also Bridgett's *Life* (p. 38, n.) for such a version of the "Erasmus aut diabolus" anecdote, given also by Cresacre More. Cf. Collier, *Bibl. Acct. Eng. Lang.*, Vol. I, p. 404, and Vol. II, p. 124, for other examples, given here, however, without references. See *Witty Apothegms* mentioned just above.

[2] Collier publishes it, giving no author, with five additional stanzas in *A Book of Roxburghe Ballads* (1847), pp. 271 ff., under the title that Jonson gives, "A Caveat for Cut-purses. To the Tune of Packington's Pound." Alden, *Bartholomew Fair*, *Yale Studies in Eng.*, XXV, pp. 192, 193, shows that the addition was made after the production of *Barth. Fair*. The anonymous "Caveat for Cut-purses" in the Roxburghe Collection of the British Museum must be the original of Collier's version. Chandler, *Literature of Roguery*, mentions a "Caveat for Cut-purses" which he does not seem to connect with Jonson, but which is perhaps the same Roxburghe version.

[3] Arber's *Transcript*, III, p. 474.

I cannot choose but place this in the third rank [of sins] . . . . all . . . . being considered the time, the place, and person there present," etc.[1] In the same year Rowlands wrote two short epigrams[2] on Selman's death, which are almost made up of phrases from the title and matter of *The Araignment.* It is noticeable that Jonson stresses the same points of Selman's enormity that are stressed by Bacon, by Rowlands, and in the title of *The Araignment.*[3] Thus not only does the recentness of Selman's deed celebrated in the ballad indicate that the ballad was written by Jonson for the play, but the exactness of the reference would indicate a like exactness for the allusion to the "seat of judgment," and render it more probable that we have here a reference to the anecdote of *Sir Thomas More.*

A further parallel between the two plays, from which, however, little can be inferred as to the indebtedness of Jonson, is found in the introduction into each, with many corresponding circumstances, of a play within a play. The puppet-show[4] in *Bartholomew Fair*, Cokes's large license of comment upon it, Busy's entering upon the scene and turning the performance to a debate with the puppets, and the closing of the puppet-show without completion may be compared with the introduction of the play[5] in *Sir Thomas More*, More's comments upon the play, his taking a part in it and improvising, and the dismissal of the players before the play has been completed. The puppet-show in *Bartholomew Fair* and the morality in *Sir Thomas More* both furnish in tone and spirit a comic contrast, like a sort of antimasque, to the plays into which they are introduced. Like the

[1] Chambers, *Book of Days*, II, p. 670. Pp. 669, 670, are given to an account of Selman, in which Bacon's speech is quoted, at least in part (with variations from Brydges, *Brit. Bibl.*, I, pp. 537, 538), and the reference in Jonson's ballad is pointed out. There are notices of *The Araignment* in Sidney Lee's *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 402; in Granger's *Biog. Hist. of Eng.*, II, p. 209; and in Caulfield's *Rem. Pers. from Reign of Edw. III to the Revolution*, I, p. 71. Brotanek discovered a reference to the incident in a letter of Chamberlain for December 31, 1611 (*Die engl. Maskenspiele*, pp. 347, 348, and *Cal. State Papers, Dom. 1611–18*, p. 104).

[2] *The Knave of Harts* (1612), p. 46 (*Works of Rowlands*, Hunterian Club, Vol. II).

[3] There is no doubt a reference to the same incident in Jonson's masque of *Love Restored.* Robin Goodfellow, in the course of a long speech, says (*Works*, III, 85): "One of the black-guard . . . . was groping of me as nimbly as the Christmas cut-purse." See Fleay, *Hist. of Stage*, p. 182; *Biog. Chron. Eng. Drama*, II, pp. 7–9; Brotanek, *Die engl. Maskenspiele*, pp. 346–48. Brotanek rejoices over his discovery of Chamberlain's reference to the cutpurse. He was not so fortunate as to read Chambers.

[4] *B. F.*, V, 3.

[5] *Sir Th. M.*, pp. 55–66.

list of plays offered by the players in *Sir Thomas More* is the list of puppet-shows which Lanthorn Leatherhead says that he has produced in his day.[1]

Again, the request of the stage-keeper in the induction of *Bartholomew Fair* at the opening of the play—

> Gentlemen, have a little patience, they are e'en upon coming instantly. He that should begin the play, Master Littlewit, the proctor, has a stitch new fallen in his black silk stocking; 'twill be drawn up ere you can tell twenty—

may have been suggested by the request of "Inclination the Vise" made just as the players are about to present *The Mariage of Witt and Wisedome* before Sir Thomas More and his guests:

> We would desire your honor but to stay a little; one of my fellowes is but run to Oagles for a long beard for young Witt, and heele be heere presently.

In each play the remark is preliminary to some jesting about the play that follows. In *Bartholomew Fair* the remark also prepares for some satire and renders it dramatically possible for Jonson to introduce some discussion of the material of comedy; in *Sir Thomas More* the playwright is enabled to present More as an improviser and to break off the inserted play before it becomes too tedious.[2]

It is worthy of note that the spirit in which Jonson deals with his characters in general, as in the case of Waspe and Justice Overdo, is found in a less bitter form in the play of *Sir Thomas More* when More overthrows Justice Suresbie. It is also found in More's treatment of Faulkner.[3] Faulkner, a servant and ruffian, almost as perverse, impudent, and irascible as Waspe, who wears his hair long and has made a vow to cut it only "when the humors are purgd, not theis three years," and who cares not for consequences, "so it bee in my humor, or the Fates becon to mee,"

[1] *B. F.*, V, 1.

[2] In the *Masque of Christmas*, produced about two years after *Bartholomew Fair*, Jonson has Carol cry out at the moment when Christmas is about to introduce his children in their appearance before the King, "Why, here be half of the properties forgotten, father" (*Works*, III, p. 107), and then just as in *Sir Thomas More* there is some merriment produced by the discussion of the situation and by the provision made for the emergency.

[3] *Sir Th. M.*, pp. 42–46, 50–53.

is brought before More for rioting. More, by sending him to prison till he shall cut his hair, purges him of that humor.[1]

The source from which the author of *Sir Thomas More* drew the material for the pocket-picking scene must be considered in its relation to *Bartholomew Fair* before it can be safely inferred that Jonson was indebted to the play. This source was of course the famous anecdote given by most of More's biographers in almost the same words. In Cresacre More's *Life* there is essentially this account.[2]

More, having heard "one of the ancient Iustices" chide the losers of purses, "saying that their negligence was cause, that there were so manie Cutt purses brought thither . . . . sent for one of the chiefe Cutt purses that was in the prison" the night after and promised to "stand his good friend, if he would cutt that Iustice's purse, whilst he sate the next day on the Benche." The thief the next day, asking to speak in private to one of the bench to excuse himself, whispered in the judge's ear and cut his purse. More, upon a signal from the thief, moved the bench to give alms to a "needie fellowe" there.

When the olde man came to open his purse, he sees it cutt away, and wondering, sayd, that he had it, when he came to sit there that morning. Sir Thomas replyed in a pleasant manner; what? will you charge anie of us with fellonie? He beginning to be angrie and ashamed of the matter, Sir Thomas calles the cutt purse and willes him to giue him his purse againe, counselling the good man hereafter not to be so bitter a censurer of innocent mens negligence, when as himself could not keepe his purse safe in that open assemblie.[3]

The general outline of Jonson's plot might as readily have been suggested by the *Life* as by the play of *Sir Thomas More*. Even the ground on which Suresbie and Waspe condemn the

[1] With the scene in *Ev. M. out of His H.* (V, 2), where Macilente causes Saviolina to declare that she can detect the gentleman beneath the clownish action of the genuine clown, Sogliardo, and thus brings her to shame, may be compared, for similarity of test and contrast in result, the scenes in *Sir Thomas More* (pp. 41, 42, 46–48) where More dresses himself as his servant and his servant as himself to test the ability of Erasmus to discern the real gentleman and scholar from the clown.

[2] I use Cresacre More's version, because it is most accessible, and, being in English, is readily compared with the plays. It seems to be a free translation of the anecdote as given by Stapleton, *Tres Thomae*, chap. xiii, and, like the other versions, differs from *Tres Thomae* in none of the important details.

[3] Cresacre More, *The Life of Sir Thomas More* (1726), pp. 86–88; Dyce's edition of *Sir Thomas More*, p. 13, n. 1.

losers of purses—their negligence as the cause of cutpurses—and the moral that is brought home to Suresbie and Waspe, are here. On the other hand, the whole spirit of Jonson's treatment is found in the play and is missing in the *Life*, and the most important parallel between the two plays, the "humour" of the overconfident man and boaster who seeks his trouble, is wanting in the *Life*. Besides, the resemblance of language is closer in the case of *Bartholomew Fair* and the play *Sir Thomas More* than in that of *Bartholomew Fair* and the *Life of Sir Thomas More*, and there are many minor details found in both plays and not in the *Life*. Evidently Jonson took the play to build upon.

As regards the similarity between *Sir Thomas More* and *Bartholomew Fair*, it should be remarked, however, that many of these parallelisms in motive reach back to the motive very common in folk and rogue tales—the ability of the shrewd thief to perform any robbery, no matter how great the odds against him. In these stories, especially the pure thief stories, there are usually several common motives. The thief must repeat the performance of a robbery, often of the same person and usually more than once, the difficulty increasing with each feat; his life is at stake for his past deeds; a great reward, usually life, is promised in case of success; the thief has confidence in his power and a roguish zest in the performance of his task; the man to be robbed is watching and equally confident; and the thief always succeeds, to the amazement of his victim. The presence of these elements in the two plays is clear. Indeed, *Bartholomew Fair* comes very near in many details to the "Master Thief" branch, one of the earliest and best versions of which is an Elizabethan tale, No. XIII of the *Merie Tales of Skelton*. We have in *Bartholomew Fair* the repeated robberies, though only one is a set task. Moreover, the thefts of the hat, coat, and sword that Cokes is wearing, and of the license from Waspe's box without the box and without Waspe's knowledge of the theft are like many incidents in the "Master Thief" and related stories[1] in having the same types of character and situation and the same tricks and methods of the rogue.

[1] Compare the Swalpo jest of stealing a man's coat off his back cited above, and the theft of the breeches in "The Two Thieves" (Groome, *Gypsy Folk-Tales*, p. 41). Waspe tells Cokes, "You'd lose your breech an 'twere loose" (*B. F.*, III, 1, *Works*, II, 179). With the

Again, Greene's works furnish some passages similar to parts of *Bartholomew Fair*, and Jonson probably got some suggestions from Greene for the treatment of Overdo and Waspe.

A Disputation betweene a Hee Conny-catcher and a Shee Conny-catcher (1592) has a story called "A pleasant Tale of a Country Farmer," etc., which is similar to the jest of *Sir Thomas More* and *Bartholomew Fair:*

It was told me for a truth that not long since here in London, there laie a country Farmar, with diuers of his neighbours about Law matters, amongst whom, one of them going to Westminster Hall, was by a Foyst stript of all the pence in his purse, and comming home, made great complaint of his misfortune: some lamented his losse, and others exclaimed against the Cutpurses, but this Farmer he laught loudly at the matter, and said such fooles as could not keep their purses no surer, were well serued, and for my part quoth hee, I so much scorne the Cutpurses, that I would thank him hartily that would take paines to foyst mine: well saies his neighbor . . . . you know not what hands Fortune may light in your owne lap: tush quoth the Farmar, heeres fortie pounds in this purse in gold, the proudest Cutpurse in England win and weare it:[1] as thus he boasted, there stood a subtill Foyst by and heard all, smiling to himselfe at the folly of the proude Farmar, and vowed to haue his purse, or venture his necke for it.

After vainly trying for some time to rob the farmer, the cutpurse secures his arrest on a false charge. A pretended quarrel is picked with the officers of the law by the cutpurses, and a riot follows in which the farmer is robbed and afterward carried to prison. A note is sent by the cutpurse to say that he mistook the man,

which note the Officer shewed him, and bad him pay his fees and go his waies: the poore Country-man was content with that, and put his hand in his pocket to feele for his purse, and God wot there was none . . . .

robbery of Waspe's box compare Grimm's story of the Master Thief's stealing the horse and leaving the rider in the saddle. Chandler, *Literature of Roguery*, pp. 62 f., comments on the connection of the "Master Thief" stories with rogue literature; Cosquin, *Contes populaires de Lorraine*, II, pp. 271-81, 364, 365, and Groome, *Gypsy Folk-Tales*, pp. 41-53, give versions of the "Master Thief" and discuss it. Cf. Campbell, *Seven Sages of Rome*, pp. lxxxv-xc for the various versions of the related "Rhampsinitus" story.

[1] In *The Thirde Part of Conny-catching* (1592), "How a Gentleman was craftily deceiued of a Chaine," etc., the gentleman, after a cutpurse who is cultivating his acquaintance "tolde a very solemne tale, of villanies and knaueries in his owne profession"—as Lifter and Nightingale do,—grows fearful and puts his chain and purse in his sleeve, saying, "If the Conny-catcher get it héere, let him not spare it." The cutpurse smiles at this "rash securitie." Accomplices pick a quarrel with the cutpurse, and in the tumult that follows, the gentleman is robbed, just as the farmer is robbed here, and as Waspe is in *Bartholomew Fair* (Greene's *Works* [Grosart] X, 179, and *B. F.*, IV, 3).

and with that fetching a great sigh he sayd, alas maisters I am vndone, my purse in this fraie is taken out of my pocket, and ten pounds in gold in it besides white money. . . . . Well, saies his neighbor, who shall smile at you now? the other day when I lost my purse you laught at mee: the Farmer brooke all, and sat malecontent, and borowed money of his neighbors to paye the Sargiant, and had a learning I beleeue [n]euer after to braue the cutpurse.[1]

We have here the confidence of the farmer and his boasting, in the vein of Suresbie, Cokes, and Waspe, that he cannot be robbed; the acceptance of the challenge by a cutpurse, who like Edgworth overhears; the free-for-all fight planned by the cutpurses just as in the robbery of Waspe; and in the end the victim sitting malcontent like Waspe, his folly brought home to him. This, however, while offering some new parallels to *Bartholomew Fair*, is not so close to Jonson as is the anecdote of Sir Thomas More.

Alden[2] points out the resemblance between the account of Nightingale and Edgworth's performances and Greene's *Thirde Part of Conny-catching*, "An other Tale of a coosening companion," etc., where two cutpurses sing ballads while their companions rob the crowd. The result also is somewhat similar in the two cases. Greene goes on to say:

But one angrie fellow, more impacient then al the rest, he falles vpon the ballade singer, and beating him with his fists well fauouredly, sayes if he had not listened his singing, he had not lost his purse, and therefore woulde not be otherwise perswaded, but that they two and the cutpurses were compacted together. The rest that had lost their purses likwise . . . . begin to tug & hale the ballad singers, when one after one the false knaues began to shrinke awaie with y^{e} pursses. By meanes of some officer then being there presēt, the two roges wer had before a Iustice.[3]

In exactly the same way, Overdo, who by his harangue collects a crowd and unwittingly causes Cokes to be robbed the first time, is accused of being an accomplice of the cutpurses and is beaten by Waspe, whereupon the cutpurse escapes; and after the second robbery of Cokes Overdo is put in the stocks under sus-

[1] Greene's *Works* (Grosart), X, pp. 213-16.

[2] *Barth. Fair* (*Yale Studies in Eng.* XXV), p. 193.

[3] Greene's *Works* (Grosart), X, pp. 162, 163.

picion of complicity. Thus Edgworth remarks when Overdo begins, "Slight, he will call company, you shall see, and put us into doings presently;" and Waspe in beating Overdo cries:[1]

> Here is a rogue is the bawd o' the cut-purses whom I will beat to begin with. . . . . You are the Patrico, are you? the patriarch of the cut-purses? You share, sir, they say; let them share this with you.[2]

Besides the *Sir Thomas More* there is another play, of uncertain date, that may offer parallels to the cutpurse scenes of *Bartholomew Fair.*[3] In the play introduced in the fifth act of Middleton's *Mayor of Queenborough* there is a resemblance to the cutpurse scenes of *Bartholomew Fair.* This play and the one in *Sir Thomas More* are introduced similarly, as Fleay points out.[4] A list of plays is given from which one is chosen, a giver of a feast takes a part in the performance, and the play is not completed. The play in *The Mayor of Queenborough*, however, is more like the puppet-show in *Bartholomew Fair*, in that to the clown Simon as to the clown Cokes everything seems very real, and each enters into the burlesque with a naïve faith in the high seriousness of the scenes. There is a similarity also in the bringing of a Puritan upon the scene in each, and in the representation on the stage of the Puritans' hostility to plays. In the play, *The Cheater and the Clown*,[5] chosen by the Mayor of Queenborough, there are two cheaters and a clown. The clown, "but a fool of a yeoman's eldest son," like Cokes has two purses, and, keeping his hands on them, dares the cheaters with a boastful self-confidence:

[1] *B. F.*, II, 1, *Works*, II, pp. 168, 170.

[2] Greene also furnishes a fairly close parallel to the title of Jonson's ballad, "A Caveat for Cut-purses." In *The Second Part of Conny-catching* (*Works*, X, pp. 106, 107), there are the words: "It boots not to tell their course . . . . at Bartholomew faire. . . . . Therefore let all men take this caueat . . . . that they tak[e] great care for their purse;" and (p. 120), "Therefore let this be a caueat to all . . . . that they beware of the gentleman Lift."

[3] Autolycus of *The Winter's Tale* belongs to the same general class as the rogues of *Bartholomew Fair*. Like Lanthorn Leatherhead, he is a chapman who has given puppet-shows on biblical subjects; he has "compassed a motion of the Prodigal Son." Like Nightingale he enters singing his songs and his chapman cries, robs the clown once, appears soon after before his victim again, warns him against cozeners, sings ballads to his victims, in which they take a part, gives a list of ballads, sells his ballads to the clown, who, like Cokes, "would not stir his pettitoes till he had both tune and words," etc. The interest aroused by *The Winter's Tale* in these typical vagabonds may have influenced Jonson.

[4] *Biog. Chron. Eng. Drama*, II, 104. [5] *M. of Q.*, V, 1.

They say there is a foolish kind of thing called a cheater abroad, that will gull any yeoman's son of his purse, and laugh in his face like an Irishman. I would fain meet with some of these creatures: I am in as good state to be gulled now as ever I was in my life, for I have two purses at this time about me, and I would fain be acquainted with that rascal that would take one of them now.

The clown is, of course, quickly robbed, and he cries before he discovers the robbery, "Still would I meet with these things called cheaters," just as Suresbie repeats his boast after he has been robbed. Then Simon, the mayor, censures the clown in the manner of Suresbie and Waspe:

A scurvy hobby-horse, that could not leave his money with me, having such a charge about him! A pox on thee for an ass!

And Simon insists on taking the clown's place in the play, daring the cheaters to rob him.

Come on, sir, [he cries,] let us see what your knaveship can do at me now: you must not think you have a clown on hand.

Simon's scorn and boasting, like Suresbie's and Waspe's, are soon punished. The cheater, throwing meal into Simon's face, takes his purse, and Simon soon learns that the players were genuine thieves.[1]

We have here the same general conception as in *Bartholomew Fair*, one stupid clown's seeking to pit himself against cheaters, only to lose, and a shrewder clown's censuring the first and, with still greater self-confidence and boasting, essaying to guard against the same fate, only to fall a more notable victim. In the representation of the first robbery as well as the second, and in the types of characters and the kind of incidents with which the motive

[1]Greene in *The Second Part of Conny-catching*, under "A merry tale how a Miller had his purse cut in New gate market" (Grosart, X, 110–13), tells how one cutpurse throws meal into his fellow's eyes, and how the victim is robbed on coming to help the cutpurse get the meal out of his eyes. That Middleton may have gotten a suggestion from Greene for *The Mayor of Queenborough* is rendered probable by the fact that in *Your Five Gallants*, IV, 8, he has another parallel to Greene. Pyamont comes in cursing his luck for going to the aid of Pursenet, who had pretended to swoon, since by it he lost his purse, from which he had not once before taken his hand. Greene, *Second Part of Conny-catching*, in "A kinde conceipt of a Foist performed in Paules" (Grosart, X, pp. 114 ff.), tells how a farmer who has kept his hand on his purse is robbed by one cutpurse while he goes to the help of another who has pretended to faint. In *The Winter's Tale*, when Autolycus robs the clown first (IV, 3), he accomplishes the robbery by lying down as if he were in a faint as the result of a beating and thus calling the clown to his aid. Chandler, *Lit. of Rog.*, p. 237, calls attention to the parallel between *The Winter's Tale* and Greene.

is worked out in *The Mayor of Queenborough*, there is a greater likeness to *Bartholomew Fair* than to *Sir Thomas More*. The plays, however, have only the general motive in common; there is none of the correspondence in language and detail that exists between *Bartholomew Fair* and *Sir Thomas More*. Consequently, even if it were certain that *The Mayor of Queenborough* in some form came before *Bartholomew Fair*, Jonson could not have gone to it for anything more than the suggestion to combine certain typical characters with a situation borrowed from *Sir Thomas More*.

After Jonson had written *Bartholomew Fair* and possibly after Middleton had written *The Mayor of Queenborough*, the two great dramatizers of purse-cutting combined their labors in *The Widow* (1615–16)[1] to produce another episode of purse-cutting, with much of its material recalling the same scene of *Sir Thomas More* that Jonson had used in *Bartholomew Fair*. The situation in this scene of *The Widow* (the latter half of IV, 2) is that of *Promos and Cassandra*, Part I, V, 5. In each play the quack surgeon, a barber in one and an empiric in the other, uses his shop and trade to draw victims for his purse-cutting. In *Promos and Cassandra* the patient's eyes are first treated, and, as he is robbed, he is told to keep them tightly closed; then his teeth receive attention, the barber commenting on his foul breath. After the robbery the barber deplores the loss of the purse and accuses one who has just left the room. The incidents of *The Widow* are the same, except that the episodes of the eyes and teeth are parceled out to the justice and his clerk, whom the quack and his assistant respectively rob, and that the barber accuses the actual thief while the quack of *The Widow* accuses a stranger. But the discovery of the loss in *The Widow*, the censure of the loser, and the return of that censure upon the censurer are from *Sir Thomas More* and *Bartholomew Fair*. As the foolish justice Brandino goes to pay the quack, he cries out with the same words—natural enough, however—that Suresbie and Cokes used, "My purse is gone." Then the censure of the master by the servant as

[1] What follows seems to me to support the assignment of this date to *The Widow*, and perhaps to strengthen the claim that Johnson had a part in the play.

in *Bartholomew Fair* follows. The resemblances of the following to what has been given are evident enough:

Bran[*dino*]. 'Tis gone, i' faith; I've been among some rascals.
Mar[*tino*, the clerk]. And that's a thing
I ever gave you warning of, master; you care not
What company you run into.
Bran. Lend me some money; chide me anon, I prithee.
. . . . . .
Mar. My purse is gone too!
Bran. How?
I'll ne'er take warning more of thee while I live then;
Thou art an hypocrite, and art not fit
To give good counsel to thy master, that
Canst not keep from ill company thyself.
Lat[*rocinio*, the quack]. This is most strange, sir;[1] both your purses gone!
Mar. Sir, I'd my hand on mine when I came in.
. . . . . :
Lat. . . . . I ha' known purses gone,
And the thief stand and look one full i' th' face,
As I may do your worship and your man now.[2]

The end of the scene and of the cutpurse's part is an adaptation from *Bartholomew Fair*. There Justice Overdo, in one of his foolish impulses, gives Quarlous his hand and seal to an unfilled warrant,[3] which Quarlous uses to release Mistress Grace from the power of her guardian, Overdo himself, at the same time forcing her to pay him for this good deed.[4] So Justice Brandino, when he cannot pay the quack, gives him his hand and seal, which are used to release from prison a fellow rogue and Martia, who has been committed by the justice; while the quack gets in recompense for his charity all the money that Martia has.

C. R. BASKERVILL

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[1] Compare the Mayor's use of the same expression when Suresbie discovers the loss of his purse, p. 7 above.

[2] Compare Lifter's statement to his prospective victim, Suresbie, *Sir Th. M.*, p. 10.

There be, sir, diuers very cunning fellowes,
That, while you stand and looke them in the face,
Will haue your purse.

[3] *B. F.*, V, 2.

[4] *B. F.*, V, 3, *Works*, II, p. 209.

A PROBABLE SOURCE FOR SOME OF THE LORE OF FITZHERBERT'S BOOK OF HUSBANDRY

The following hitherto unnoticed scrap from a flyleaf of the well-known fifteenth-century manuscript, Cotton Galba E IX, of the British Museum collection, is worth noticing because of its apparently direct connection with *Fitzherbert's Book of Husbandry*, and of its indirect influence as a source of certain references in Elizabethan literature.

On fol. 113*b* we read:

The horss hath XXV propertes, þat ys to say, he hath iiii off a lyon, iiii of an ox, iiii off an asse, iiii off an hare, and iiii of a fox, and v of a woman. After a lyon, prowd-herted, brod-brestid, iiii good legis, and a stowte stern; after the ox, out-ribbed, low-brawned, schort-pasterd, and well ifed; after the asse, well mouthid, well wynded, streght-bakked, and rownd foted; after the hare, steep yen, wyght off fote, tornyng on litell grownde, ii god filetts; after the fox, prik-eryd, fayr-sided, schorte trottyng, and a litell hed; after a woman, mery of chere, brod-buttokyd, and esy to lep on, good at long-rynnyng, and steryng vnder a man.

Heded as an ox;
Tayled as [a] fox;
Comly as a kyng;
Nekkyd as a dukyng;
Mowythyd as a kliket;
Witted [as] a wodkok
Wylled as a wedercoke.[1]

Another similar piece is preserved in the British Museum MS Lansdowne 762 (f. 16), which was printed by Wright and Halliwell (*Reliquiae Antiquae* I. 232, 233):

A good horsse must have XV propertyes and condicions, that is to witte, iii of a man, iii of a woman, iii of a ffox, iii of an hare, and iii of an asse. Of a man, bolde, prowde and hardy; of a woman, fayre-brested, fayre of here, and esy to lepe vpon; of a fox, a faire tayle, short eres, with a good trotte; of an hare, a grete eye, a drye heed, and wele rennyng;

[1] Printed by W. H. Hulme, in *The Middle-English Harrowing of Hell and Gospel of Nicodemus*, London, 1907 (*EETS*, Extra Series C, *Introd.*, p. xxv).

of an asse, a bigge chynne, a flat leg, and[1] a good houe. Wele traveled wymen or wele traveled horsses were neuer good.

It is not easy to determine which of these pieces represents the original or the more primitive form. From the point of view of simplicity, one would be forced to say the Lansdowne version is earlier, and that the Cotton version is a later and slightly modified form of this interesting bit of farriers' lore. And it may be assumed with some degree of certainty that the description of the qualities of a good horse in the *Book of Husbandry* is derived, with considerable additions and modifications, from the Lansdowne or Cotton recension. The account in Fitzherbert runs as follows:[2]

71. The Properties of horses.

And first thou shalt knowe, that a good horse hath liiii propertyes, that is to say, ii of a man, ii of a bauson or a badger, iiii of a lyon, ix of an oxe, ix of an hare, ix of a foxe, ix of an asse, and x of a woman.

72. The two properties, that a horse hath of a man.

The fyrste is, to haue a proude harte; and the seconde is, to be bolde and hardy.

73. The .ii. propertyes of a bauson.

The fyrste is, to haue a whyte rase or a ball in the foreheed; the seconde, to haue a whyte fote.

74. The iiii properties of a lyon.

The fyrste is, to haue a brode breste; the seconde, to be styffe-docked; the thyrde, to be wylde in countenance; the fourthe, to have four good legges.

75. The ix propertyes of an oxe.

The fyrste is, to be brode-rybbed; the .ii., to be lowe-brawned; the thyrde, to be shorte-pasturned; the iiii, to haue graatte senewes; the fyfte, to be wyde betwene the challes; the syxte is, to haue great nosethrylles; the vii, to be bygge on the chyn; the viii, to be fatte and well fedde; the ix, to be vpryghte standynge.

76. The ix propertyes of an hare.

The fyrste is, styffe-eared; the second, to haue greate eyen; the thyrde, round eyen; the fourth, to haue a leane heed; the .v., to haue leane knees; the syxte, to be wyght on foote: the vii, to turne vpon a lyttell grounde; the viii, to haue shorte buttockes; the ix to have two good fyllettes.

[1] Italicized resolutions of manuscript abbreviations in the reprints are not indicated here.

[2] Cf. *The Book of Husbandry. By Master Fitzherbert.* Reprinted from the edition of 1534, and edited, etc., by Rev. Walter W. Skeat for the Dialect Society, London, 1882, pp. 63-65.

77. The ix propertyes of a foxe.

The fyrste is, to be prycke-eared; the second, to be lyttell-eared; the thyrde, to be rounde-syded; the fourthe, to be syde-tayled; the fyfte, to be shorte-legged; the syxte, to be blacke-legged; the .vii, to be shorte-trottynge; the viii, to be well coloured; the .ix., to have a lyttel heed.

78. The ix propertyes of an asse.

The fyrste is, to be small-mouthed; the seconde, to be longe-rayned; the iii, to be thyn-cressed; the fourthe, to be streyght-backed; the fyfth, to haue small stones; the syxte, to be lathe-legged; the vii, to be rounde-foted; the eyght, to be holowe-foted; the ix, to have a toughe houe.

79. The x properties of a woman.

The fyrst is, to be mery of chere; the seconde, to be well-paced; the thyrde, to haue a brode foreheed; the fourth, to haue brode buttockes; the fyfthe, to be harde to warde; the syxte, to be easye to lepe vppon; the vii, to be good at a longe iourneye; the viii, to be well sturryng vnder a man; the ix, to be alwaye besye with the mouthe; the tenth, euer to be chowynge on the brydell.

Now, part of Fitzherbert's description is virtually reproduced by Robert Greene in an interesting conversation between Slipper and Ateukin in his *Scottish Hystorie of James the Fourth*, I, ii, 476 ff.[1] In commenting on the "bille" presented by Slipper which recites at length his good qualities as a servant, Ateukin, who is looking for such a person, says, among other things:

Art thou so good in keeping a horse? I pray thee tell me how many good qualities hath a horse?

Slip. Why, so, sir: a horse hath two properties of a man, that is, a proude heart, and a hardie stomacke; foure properties of a Lyon, a broad brest, a stiffe docket,—hold your nose, master,—a wild countenance, and 4 good legs; nine properties of a Foxe, nine of a Hare, nine of an Asse, and ten of a woman.

Ateu. A woman! why, what properties of a woman hath a Horse?

Slip. O, maister, know you not that? Draw your tables, and write what wise I speake. First, a merry countenance; second, a soft pace; third, a broad forehead; fourth, broad buttockes; fift, hard of warde; sixt, easie to leape vpon; seuenth, good at long journey; eight, mouing vnder a man; ninth, always busie with the mouth; tenth, euer chewing on the bridle.

[1] Cf. *The Plays and Poems of Robert Greene*, edited by J. Churton Collins. Oxford, 1905, Vol. II, pp. 102 f. The editor also draws attention (p. 353) to Greene's source, that is, *The Book of Husbandry*.

We have no doubt to look to some such source for the original of the following stanza in Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis*, describing Adonis' horse:

> Round-hoof'd, short-jointed, fetlocks shag and long,
> Broad breast, full eye, small head and nostril wide,
> High crest, short ears, straight legs and passing strong,
> Thin mane, thick tail, broad buttock, tender hide;
> Look, what a horse should have he did not lack,
> Save a proud rider on so proud a back.[1]

WILLIAM H. HULME

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY
Cleveland, Ohio

[1] *Venus and Adonis*, Eversley ed., 295–300.

A NOTE ON *SIR THOPAS*

In Tyrwhitt's edition of Chaucer, in *The Rime of Sire Thopas*, occurs the following passage:

> Into his sadel he clombe anon,
> And priked over stile and ston
> An elf-quene for to espie,
> Til he so long had ridden and gone,
> That he fond in a privee wone
> The contree of Faerie.
>
> *Wherin he soughte North and South,*
> *And oft he spied with his mouth*
> *In many a forest wilde;*
> For in that contree n'as ther non,
> That to him dorst ride or gon,
> Neither wife ne childe.[1]

It is to the italicized lines that I wish to call attention. It is clear that Tyrwhitt thought something was wrong with them. In his note on the passage he says: "whether the two lines and part of another which I have inserted before 'wilde' from other MSS be genuine, I will not be positive, but it is very clear, I think, that something is wanting."[2]

In 1888 Kölbing, in a discussion of *Sir Thopas* in which he corrected and casually reviewed a dissertation on the subject, remarked: "Bennewitz hat unser gedicht so wenig eingehend studirt, dass er nicht einmal beachtet dass die für *so wilde* bei Tyrwhitt eingesetzten drei verse sind in keiner hs. finden und wohl erst von diesem zugedichtet sind."[3]

In Skeat's *Oxford Chaucer* we read: "Instead of this short line [so wilde] Tyrwhitt has 'wherin he sought' [etc.]. But none of our seven MSS agrees with this version, nor are the lines found in the black-letter editions."[4]

These two quotations amount to the same thing. Both Kölbing and Skeat suspected Tyrwhitt of having filled out the apparently

[1] *The Canterbury Tales of Chaucer* (London, 1775–78), Vol. II, p. 234, ll. 13726 ff.
[2] *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, p. 317. [3] *Engl. Stud.*, XI, p. 503. [4] Vol. V, p. 190.

deficient text on his own authority, and of having tried to conceal his responsibility by an indefinite reference to "other MSS." And in the absence of evidence to the contrary Skeat's statement that the three lines in question appear in neither manuscript nor black-letter edition would appear decisive. As a matter of fact, however, the three lines were in the folio used by Tyrwhitt in establishing his text. This is easily proved by a refereuce to the book itself, catalogued in the Harvard University Library as "Tyrwhitt's collations for his edition of the *Canterbury Tales*." This edition, as was pointed out to me by Professor Kittredge, is that of 1687, number seven in Skeat's list of the "First eight editions of the collected works of Chaucer."[1] The folio volume has been cut apart, interleaved, and annotated by Tyrwhitt. With painstaking care he corrected bad spellings, restored words dropped through printer's errors, repunctuated the text, and bracketed doubtful lines. On the blank pages he indicated the MS variants, recording the different readings so fully that had he printed his notes as well as his text much of the work of future editors would have been anticipated. Thus besides marking these three lines as doubtful, he made this entry on the page inserted: "Want in C. 1: C. 2: C: A. 1. 2. Ca. 2."[2]

Tyrwhitt, then, certainly did not insert these three lines for the first time. At the worst he simply included in his own version a passage which someone else had already made current, and which seemed to him to fill a break in the manuscripts. The question then arises, where did this passage originate? The 1532 edition, Skeat's No. 1, reads:

> Tyl he so longe hath ridden and gon
> That he fonde in a priue wone
> The countre of Fayrie. So wylde
> For in that countre nas ther non
> Neither wyfe ne chylde.[3]

All the others until 1602 retain this reading, with slight changes of spelling. In this, however, the sixth in the list, we find the

[1] See Skeat's reprint of the 1532 edition, pp. xv and xvi; and elsewhere in his edition of Chaucer.

[2] For explanation of the abbreviations see Vol. I, pp. xxii and xxiii, of Tyrwhitt's *Canterbury Tales*.

[3] Skeat's reprint, p. 188, col. 1, ll. 31 ff.

intrusion of the three lines which Tyrwhitt had marked as doubtful in his own annotated 1687 folio. This 1602 version was the second edited by Thomas Speght,—the first had appeared in 1598,—who says in his dedication to Sir Robert Cecil: "Now therefore . . . . both by old written copies, and by Ma. William Thynns praise-worthy labours, I have reformed the whole worke, whereby Chaucer for the most part is restored to his owne Antiquitie." Again, in the address "To the Readers," he says that with the help of "M. Francis Thynn" he has "the text by old copies corrected." This then, Speght's 1602 edition, was evidently intended to represent the most advanced stage of Chaucerian scholarship, and its editor was proud of the contributions it contained. Perhaps some day an "old copy" will turn up and show that Speght in his turn had authority for his additions to *Sir Thopas;* but till it does I believe it is safe to assume that either he or Thynne was responsible for the three lines that heretofore have been charged to the account of Tyrwhitt.

Franklyn Bliss Snyder

Harvard University

Modern Philology

Vol. VI *October, 1908* No. 2

MEDIAEVAL LATIN LYRICS

PART III

GOLIARD LYRICS AND POPULAR LYRICS

The richest anthology of mediaeval Latin songs, the *Carmina burana*, has been very generally assigned to the goliards. This is unwarrantable. There is no evidence either external or internal to lead us to suspect goliardic origin for much of the colorful musicality of these erotic lyrics. The cause for the mistake is not, however, far to seek.

Since the epoch-making article of Giesebrecht it has been commonly believed that there once existed a sodality of wandering students, or, what amounts to the same thing, that all the discoverable body of Latin lyric poetry during the Middle Ages was written by a cultured, clerical stripe of people who were in the main subject to similar social and literary traditions. With this false belief in mind, Hubatsch therefore follows out the characteristics which separate goliard poetry, on the one hand from vernacular poetry (that of the *jongleur* and the *spielmann*), on the other hand from ecclesiastical poetry, and gains criteria which are worth little or nothing, because they are only half the truth. Half the truth, since his conclusions are correct for only part of the material he is studying, for the songs of the wandering students which cling to classical and churchly molds and formulae. For such a song as No. 88 which we have just studied at

length, for Latin lyrics which reflect simple *volkslieder*, Hubatsch's conclusions are wrong.[1]

Let us drive a nail here quickly. Hubatsch says:

By their profession the goliards were on the same plane with the *jongleurs* and the *spielleute;* they were to the clergy what the latter were to the laymen. But the goliard felt himself quite another person than the *jongleur;* at all events outward circumstances placed a deep gulf between them. With but few exceptions the *jongleur* and *spielmann* were considered outlaws, while the goliard possessed his clerical privileges, which gave him important advantages over others, besides which as a scholar he contrasted with the singer who lacked a learned culture. The goliards are *viri literati* and wish to consort only with *viris literatis.* This exclusive adherence to a formal culture permeates all their poetry and forms a sharp contrast between it and that of the laity. Diction and content, comparisons, figures of speech, poetic mythology, the whole manner of expression in their poems is fundamentally different from that of the lay poet.

Now let us choose a simple Latin dance-song from the *Carmina burana* and see what becomes of the *viri literati.*

Ver redit optatum
Cum gaudio,
Flore decoratum
Purpureo,
Aves edunt cantus
Quam dulciter,
Revirescit nemus,
Cantus est amoenus
Totaliter.

Juvenes ut flores
Accipiant,
Et se per odores
Reficiant,
Virgines assumant
Alacriter,
Et eant in prata
Floribus ornata
Communiter.

[1] This failure to differentiate between learned and unlearned Latin poetry has caused confusion from the beginning. Scherer and Wackernagel were right in asserting that the flourishing Latin poetry of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries harked back to an earlier period of bloom when the knowledge of this language was widely disseminated (cf. Scherer, *Gesch. d. deut. Dichtung im xi. u. xii. Jhdt.*, p. 5; *Anzeiger f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. I, p. 202; Wackernagel, *Gesch. d. deut. Lit.*, p. 70; Ebert, *Allgem. Gesch. d. Lit. des Mittelalters*, Vol. III, p. 347: "The Latin songs of the Cambridge MS because of the popular character of their themes and their form show how far into the background the native language was crowded in the cultured circles of Germany at that time"). Scherer could thus assume that the songs of the wandering students had in Germany a long time of preparation behind them. It was likewise right for him to say that under the Salic emperors the understanding of Latin greatly diminished among laymen and that the Latin lyric practically disappeared from conscious literature until it was reawakened through the indirect influence of the French schools. But immediately thereafter to remark with Scherer and Laistner (*Golias*, p. 99) that mediaeval Latin love-poetry preceded that of Germany, northern France, and Provence, that the *Carmina burana* are nearer folk-poetry than the songs of any other old German manuscript—this is to deal with matters *en bloc* when the only possible helpfulness of treatment lies in discerning analysis of them.

We have here a song that is taken almost word for word from vernacular lays. R. M. Meyer has brought together from Neidhart a suggestive list of poetical phrases which indicate with certainty the sort of source we must seek for such Latin strophes. Not that they are taken from Neidhart—far from it! But some Latin *minnesang* like some German *minnesang* is derived from a common basis: the lyric *volkslied.*[1]

A narrow examination of the lyric pieces of the *Carmina burana*, those poems, I mean, which deal with spring and love and wine, will convince us that only occasionally are they songs that have been written down free-hand in answer to the call of the moment that held the poet in its grasp. They are rather suggestive of a score of different things which served directly as models for composition: church-hymns, sometimes, and school poems; classical verses excerpted from some favorite anthology,[2] or *volkslieder* known from childhood. Thus, nature introductions as naïve as any in popular song nestle close to labored expositions of the *vis naturae* and to mythological personifications taught in the grammar schools. This teaches us that only seldom were these lyric pieces composed by *al fresco* poets who moved sturdily and

[1] R. M. Meyer (*Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XXIX, p. 224) says: "There exists an important interrelationship between German folk-poetry and the pieces of the wandering students. The *vagi* were after all children of the people and had grown up among the games and dances of their home. With equal certainty we must assume an influence of *volkslieder* upon the goliard songs and vice versa." For a more general development of the same statement cf. Schneider, *Das musikalische Lied in geschichtlicher Entwicklung* (1863), Vol. I, pp. 193 ff., "Die Fahrenden als Vermittler zwischen Volkslied und Kunstlied."

[2] So much has been made of the contrast between the present age, when the literary productions of widely separated times and peoples surround us in such immeasurable abundance, and the Middle Ages, when oral transmission by way of priest and minstrel was practically the sole source of spiritual nourishment for him who sought after culture, that we are apt to give too little weight to the part played by books and school texts during the "dark" and "middle" centuries. Anthologies and MSS of *excerpta* and *exempla* bound the past to the Middle Ages as firmly, if not as clearly, as printed books bind it to us, and there is no more need of assuming continuity of oral tradition when we find a mediaeval poem derived from an earlier source than there is to assume the same thing when we discover Jonson's *Song to Celia* to be the reworking of phrases in a sophist's love-letter. Laukhardt's "beautiful song *Ecce quam bonum* brayed forth on the street to the vast joy of the Giessen nymphs" (*Laukhardts . . . . Leben und Schicksale* [1792], Vol. I, p. 96; *Annalen der Universität Schilda* [1798], Vol. I, p. 86) is due of course to the chance reawakening of a forgotten ninth-century hymn (Mone, *Lateinische Hymnen des Mittelalters* [1853], Vol. I, pp. 393 f.) and not to the parodying of one which had been sung during the intervening nine centuries; Traube has shown that the student song, which Kopp and Schmitz presumed to be written and sung in the Fulda cloister school at some Eastertide during the ninth century, derives from a Roman prototype of the fifth century (*Neues Archiv*, Vol. XXV, pp. 625 f.), but this means simply that a thieving teacher got his verses from a book, not that he had ever heard them sung in his life before he wrote them down.

unconsciously in their Latin medium; it was rather a thing at second hand for most of them. Archpoet and Golias might utter the *Cum in orbem*, the *Aestuans interius*, and the *Utar contra vitia*, as if they were to the manner born, Walter of Chatillon might tread the stately measures of his *Propter Sion non tacebo* with careless ease, Simon Chèvre d'or and Hugo of Orleans might retell the Fall of Ilium with never a hesitant moment; but the real lyric pieces are of another brood. They are put together of patches and the seams show.[1] Often we may not speak of a song as a whole but must try to divide it into its various parts, to see what underlies it. But while this makes any study of such poems more difficult it frequently gladdens us, for we learn at times that part of it, or perhaps the entire substratum of it, is a *volkslied*. And what an insight we then gain of the men who wrote these songs! A new class of author is apparent in them; one that we should, truly, expect to find in any age except the sort of time scholars have imagined twelfth and thirteenth centuries to be. Not alone *berühmte Professoren* must we add to the goliards as the writers of Latin verse in the Middle Ages, not alone "ecclesiastics, jurists, physicians, and teachers," but, also, the third type of person whom the modern world denominates just "a common, ordinary poet." Not clerks and students were they always, with the Latin learning of their time at their fingers' ends. Often self-taught and barely taught German poets[2] who lightened the burdens of the day by

[1] No further proof of this important fact is needed than that adduced by R. M. Meyer in his oft-cited article. No. 107 in the *Carmina burana*, for instance, is found to be actually without a single original line to bless itself with, and for other songs in this collection Meyer's remarkable industry has discovered so many parallels both Latin and German that one marvels at their number.

Sometimes a song is nothing more than a cento of lines from other well-known poems. Thus the song *Hac in die rege nato* (*Analecta hymnica*, Vol. XX, p. 123) is wholly made up of the initial lines of twenty-six *conductus* poems, as Wilhelm Meyer discovers (*Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, Vol. II, p. 329).

[2] Scholars have at times distinguished with some sharpness between the Latin poems such as were in vogue at the great schools of France and the goliard songs: cf. Delisle, *Annuaire bulletin de la Société de l'histoire de France* (1885), p. 103; Dreves, *Analecta hymnica*, Vol. XX (1895), p. 8; Meyer, *Göttinger Nachrichten* (1907), p 88. But none of them, so far as I remember, has cared to add a third class of poets to the well-established divisions of noted teachers in the schools and the graceless ne'er-do-wells. This third type of authors we should not seek in any one profession or clan, but among any and all classes of people with sufficient culture to borrow, remake, or sing newly forth a few doggerel stanzas of simplest Latin. Some of these authors, to be sure, must have had a smattering of the Latin of the schools—else they could not have moved in the foreign medium. One cannot exactly

reproducing songs of spring and love. Nor can we call the result ill, for a lightness and sprightliness is not unusual in these songs, a cadence and swing which surprises and takes us captive.

This musicality need not, however, cause us wonder. German poets have at all times caught the secret of it. It is true that certain of the more ostentatious poems in the *Carmina burana* may be part-songs taken from, or based upon, the motet collections of France, with their two and three different systems of musical notation; but it is equally true that certain of the simpler songs are not. They sung themselves as satisfactorily out of the setting of popular mediaeval airs as they do today to the sound of *In der grossen Seestadt Leipzig, Ich bin der Doktor Eisenbart, Prince Eugen der edle Ritter, Fuchs, du hast die Gans gestohlen.* And let us take heed not to ridicule without good cause the plagiarism of these south German poets and call their work cobbling. For they were without exception trying to do what nineteenth-century German poets have done: raise a *volkslied* to the state and condition of accepted artistic verse by incorporating some of it, or some of its diction and figurative utterance at least, in new poems of their own. And the result in both cases has justified the means.

It is doubtless best that at this point I tell what I mean by *volkslied*, a term that from now on I shall have to use with increasing frequency. I do not believe it to be a song composed by a number of people acting in concert (Grimm: "*das Volk dichtet;*" Gummere: "communal song"), nor do I conceive it as a poem sung by the lower classes alone ("people" in the sense of "populace" or "rabble"), nor do I think it necessarily a naïve compound of homely diction which mirrors the simple processes of the unlettered mind (Herder, Bürger, Brentano, and Krejci). A *volkslied* is merely a song which we historically know, or assume, has proven to be very popular.

It is not written by a humble man of the people who dwells aside from the crowded centers of life, although such a song once learned this man may continue it for generations. Impulse to

speak of "native woodnotes wild" when a German, say, writes Latin. But except for this there is in certain dainty bits of the *Carmina burana* no hint of either learned or dissolute scholasticism.

authorship is lacking, reserve encases him like a shell. The unlettered and unalert do not achieve poetic coherence and build emotional expression out into even the the simplest art-forms. The unique effectiveness and beauty of German popular balladry is due neither to small and isolated mediaeval communities working mysteriously together in the throes of lyrical composition, nor yet to unimaginative men inspired to spasmodic effort. For such inspiration did not dwell in the mediaeval environment except stirred crowds gathered, unless the initial impulse be of another world than this and we imagine a succession of German Caedmons whose lips were regularly opened by sense and sight of divinity. If we should find in segregated communities today—the Tennessee mountaineers, for instance—a simple lyric of power and beauty, of mock and humor and suffering, then I could imagine that in days of yore similar submerged processes went forward. But, failing this, there is for me now as ten years ago but one definition of *volkslied:* a song, from whatever source, sung for a long time by all kinds of people.[1]

Who would it be that evolved *liedlein* which the people cherished and curiously clung to? Some one artist driven thereto by the spirit of his surroundings. Who would carry them from one countryside to another? Most often and most continuously the minstrel. It would be he who was most desirous to add to his stock from that of other minstrels fresh home from their travels. And he, we may be sure, it was who collected Latin songs as well as German ones, in order that no audience might go away from his singing hungry.

But why should we call this minstrel "goliard"? If we mean by this word a cultured product of the French schools, a finished though degenerate *baccalaureus artium*, we see how wrong its application occasionally is. Such a person did not compose and sing many of the popularizing ballads which we have cited throughout this study, which we are to add to below. But if, on the contrary, we would imply by "goliard" anyone during twelfth and thirteenth centuries who sang Latin dance-couplets modeled on the *reigen* of the village festivals, who indited pastoral

[1] Cf. my discussion of this in *Journal of Germanic Philology*, Vol. III (1899).

songs and *tagelieder*, lovers' parting-songs and ballads of deserted maidens, then we employ a single term too loosely. For it indicates everybody who caroled forth during the Middle Ages a lyric phrase in the *lingua Romana* between the Scotch borders and Sicily.

No. It is best to retain "goliard" in the sense that till now has been generally accepted, viz., a wandering student possessed of a particular sort of training that shone through his songs. And such a one wrote all the amatory stanzas in the MSS of St. Omer and Queen Christine and practically all in the Cambridge MS. But at least a third of the erotic lyrics in the *Carmina burana* betray the work of another sort of person. This we shall now specify with some detail. The clearest way to handle the material, I believe, is to study the analogies and the differences between goliard poems and popular Latin songs in a series of short chapters designed to show forth succinctly the most marked contrasts which they offer: (I) Learned Folk-poetry; (II) Treatment of Love-themes; (III) Treatment of Nature; (IV) Classical and Popular Allusions.[1]

I. LEARNED FOLK-POETRY

Once upon a time a critic bethought him of early mediaeval times in Europe and after meditating deeply said: "I know nothing of those ages which mean nothing"—whereupon he turned the searchlight of his mind to more illuminable business. I confess o a similar state of ignorance regarding the specious phrase learned folk-poetry," for it means nothing that I have discovered. This phrase is of course a translation of the German *gelehrte volksdichtung* which is a winged word persistently used by students of the mediaeval Latin lyric and must therefore be reckoned with. I believe its wings should be clipped.

The use of the caption sprang from the following conditions: Goliard poetry is permeated by a learned culture which offers a

[1] Hubatsch has a chapter on the analogies which goliard poetry shows to popular poetry (*Lat. Vagantenlieder*, pp. 41 ff.; cf. also Steinthal, *Zeitschr. f. Völkerpsychologie*, Vol. XI [1879], pp. 39 ff.), but he deals only with the longer pieces which are not lyric! He asserts that it would carry him too far to treat of the shorter songs of the wandering students and therefore gravely chooses his material just where it can least be found: in the *Confessio*, the *Utar contra vitia*, and the *Propter Sion*.

sharp contrast to the unclerical or lay songs of the period. Diction and content, comparisons and figures, poetic mythology—the whole manner of expression in these student songs is fundamentally different from those of the lay-poets.[1] But none the less does this learned poetry show a certain kinship to vernacular popular poetry. It borrows freely from, and makes large use of, traditional material, maintains a conventionalized symbolism in thought and expression, crystallizes certain turns of speech into formulae.[2] I is anonymous, is prone to generalize rather than present the individual view of a certain author, fits therefore the need of the many more than it does the casual exigency of any single class. Finally, it at times exhibits something of the terseness and carelessness of detail which is the hallmark of lyric popular poetry in all ages.

Then was the phrase "learned folk-poetry" begotten to characterize the Latin efforts of the schools which contained here and there a slight alloy of the matter and manner of vernacular lyric verse. As if one should rename some precious metal because of its admixture with an adulterant that gives it currency in commerce. Lyrical alloy veins most of the oldest German epic narratives, as surely as it does the Anglo-Saxon elegiac fragments.[3] Many years ago Müllenhoff called attention to the tones of melting tenderness which sound in certain old Norse poems: in the death-greeting which Hialmar sends Ingibiörg (*Hervararsaga*), in the Völundarquiða, the conclusion of the second song of Helgi and Sigrun, the opening five stanzas of the third Sigurdarquiða, etc.[4] But if he cited these passages as proof that there was lyricality of expression in the heroic age, he did not coin a phrase for them *in toto* such as "epic *volkslieder*." For he knew that they were withheld from being lyrics by the unlyric clan-appeal they made and were intended to make upon their auditors.[5] Nothing in their verse structure or in any externality of manner and meter pre-

[1] Cf. Hubatsch, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

[2] Hubatsch, *ibid.*, p. 41.

[3] Cf. Körting, *Die Anfänge der Renaissanceliteratur in Italien* (1884), Part I, pp. 36 f.; Allen, *Modern Philology*, Vol. III, p. 438.

[4] Cf. Müllenhoff-Scherer, *Denkmäler* (1892)[3], Vol. II, p. 154.

[5] I believe this point has never been more reasonably or deftly argued than by Mr. Gummere in his "Primitive Poetry and the Ballad," *Modern Philology*, Vol. I (1903), pp. 221 ff.

vented such songs from being called folk-lyrics; they have color and musicality of rhythm, a soft melancholy and a dreamy romanticism, but epic they remain, ballads they are because of the impersonal, unindividual, communal background that is found in them.

Similarly does one speak of "ecclesiastical folk-songs" (*geistliche volkslieder*). This phrase may serve—I do not care—when a churchman like Luther writes a hymn which encircles the earth and outlasts time; or when *contrafacta hymns* are made by the easy process of word substitution in *Von fernen Landen komm ich her*, *Innsbruck, ich muss dich lassen*,[1] although this latter process generally results in doubtful popularity. But to term ecclesiastical folk-song any of the stilted and metrical Latinization of vernacular lays is again to speak by the book and not by the word of truth.[2]

Similarly we meet in goliardic poetry of high and low degree occasional muffled suggestions of lyric *volkslieder*. But it is grievous because of this to designate distinctly learned verse "folk-poetry." For, in the nature of things, if poetry is composed in the Latin argot of culture it cannot be widely understood and sung; whereas, if a popular song be taken and overloaded with scholastic niceties it ceases to be popular. In neither case have we what may be called a *volkslied*.

I would accordingly renew the plea already made in this study,[3] that zeal be not allowed to run off with reason, that we do not

[1] Cf. for instance Budde, *Preussische Jahrbücher*, Vol. LXXIII, p. 482.

[2] Many another churchman in the Middle Ages followed the example of Thomas of York who never heard a popular secular song or ballad sung by the minstrels that he did not immediately compose a sacred parody on the words: "Si quis in auditu ejus arte joculatoria aliquid vocale sonaret, statim illud in divinas laudes effigiabat," *Biog. Lit.*, p. 25. One Frenchman took such an interest in vernacular songs and Latin parodies of them that he based his sermo de sancta Maria on the ballad *Bele Aliz matin leva*, and in the course of his homily quotes the couplet:

sicut lilium inter spinas,
sic amica mea inter filias.

P. Meyer, *Romania*, Vol. XXXVI, p. 501. Many a Latin sermon relies for its interest, its theme, or its illustrative material upon popular diction, proverbial wit, vernacular songs, etc. I may take space perhaps for another instance:

"Exemplum de clerico quodam de quo narratur quod, cum esset Parisius ad fenestram et audiret cantilenam in vico, in qua dicebatur

Li tens s'en veit
Et je n'ei riens fait;
Li tens revient
Et je ne fais riens

primo coepit cogitare cantus dulcedinem, etc."—Hauréau, Vol. III, p. 341.

[3] Cf. *supra*, Part I, p. 40.

refer to the school-poetry of the goliards as popular verse, but retain the latter rubric for "lewd" and unlettered couplets wherever they occur. In a few songs of the *Carmina burana* we have popularizing lyrics of such transparent lightness throughout; but more frequently by far we have this popular phrase or that *volkslied*-stanza inserted or appended where all the rest of the Latin poem is learned and unyielding. In such a case this alloy-material is to be regarded as simply the salt that savors, not as the yeast that leavens the whole lump so that it becomes "learned olk-poetry." Like alloy, it remains the intruder, and merely testifies interestingly to the fact that where we find learned poems constantly and almost unconsciously refreshing themselves at the well-spring of popular-song, there we have certain evidence that there floated everywhere about, like thistledown, German *volkslieder* and Latin stanzas of a similar sort, ready for the using.

Since Richard M. Meyer's genial listing of the popular phrases which shine out of the Latin lyrics in the *Carmina burana* there is happily no reason to burden our page with the lumber of much evidence,[1] but one of several illustrations not given by him may be permitted me, to show how a popular stanza would worm its way in where ordinarily it would be least expected.

After the manner of the goliards some wandering student has taken a French (or Italian) pastoral and "refined" it. Here and there the lightness of the original shimmers, but the effect of the whole is stilted and in no sense popular:

Vere dulci mediante,
Non in Maio, paulo ante,
Luce solis radiante
Virgo vultu elegante
Fronde stabat sub vernante
Canens cum cicuta.

Illuc veni fato dante.
Nymphâ non est formae tantae,
Aequipollens ejus plantae,
Quae me viso festinante
Grege fugit cum balante
Metu dissoluta.[2]

[1] Cf. the oft-cited article, *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XXIX.

[2] *Carmina burana*, No. 120.

Now mediaeval maidens are beaten always, so the story of folk-song goes,[1] if they be discovered with an unknown lover; and therefore our "nymph" is terrified. But in this instance she does not express her fear in a fashion that may be called foreign to the district of Benedictbeuern; she speaks good German: "Wenn's der Vater wüsste oder Martin gar, der ältere Bruder, so würde das mir ein schwarzer Tag sein . . . . usw."

Si senserit meus pater
Vel Martinus major frater,
Erit mihi dies ater;
Vel si sciret mea mater,
Cum sit angue pejor quater,
Virgis sum tributa.[2]

II. TREATMENT OF LOVE THEMES

The goliard lyric deals with the passion of love in a way that is esteemed brutal. Desire for the quick and physical possession of the beloved object is often stated with a boldness of diction that borders on what we feel to be pruriency.[3]

[1] Cf. *Carmina burana*, No. 52: Sunt parentes mihi saevi; mater longioris aevi irascetur pro re levi (Sô slüege mich diu muoter mîn, das waere mir lîhte zorn; Uhland, Vol. IV³, p. 225); Du Méril (1847), p. 229: Mater est inhumana; regrediar, ni feriar materna virgula (Ich will nicht mit euch gahn, mein Vater würde mich schelten, meine Mutter würde mich schla'n; Uhland, Vol. III³, p. 275); Jeanroy, *Origines*², p. 195; Heider, *Untersuchungen zur mittelenglischen erotischen Lyrik* (1905), pp. 53 f.; Nicholson, *Old German Love Songs*, p. 127; Neidhart and his fellow-poets tell how the buoyant daughter is ever chided by her mother; Uhland, Vol. III, p. 276.

[2] This stanza has ever sounded German in my ears because of the girl's platitudinous and unblushing directness. National style read through the mask of Latin is often no safe criterion, but sometimes it convinces. Hauréau believes one song (No. 65) Italian chiefly because of this: "Ce cachet n'est pas simplement la grâce; c'est encore la grâce italienne, aux agaceries voluptueuses, celle qui distingue les fantaisies littéraires de Boccace et de l'Arioste comme les vivantes peintures du Corrège et de Giorgion." Cf. also Huet, *Romania*, Vol. XXII (1893), p. 536, and Santangelo, *Studio sulla poesia goliardica*, pp. 82 ff., and the tenets of Winterfeld on *heimatkunst* discussed below in the chapter on drinking-songs. Symonds writes in his *Wine, Women, and Song* (p. 30): "The *Carmina burana*, by their frequent references to linden-trees and nightingales and their numerous German refrains, indicate a German home for the poems on spring and love, in which they are specially rich. The more I study the songs of love and wine in this codex, the more convinced am I that they have their origin for the most part in South-Western Germany, the Bodensee, and Elsass."

[3] This fact was conditioned partly no doubt by the foreign medium in which the poet sang. Hubatsch says (*Lat. Vagantenlieder*, p. 19): "If in the vernacular songs the poet's words echoed warmly in every heart, the Latin author had to appeal to the reason of his auditor who was translating what he heard into his mother-tongue. The restriction of the poet's vocabulary made him coarser in expression, permitted him to say things without veiling them; he is plainer, more forcible, less considerate than the courtly poet."

I shall not say what constitutes chastity in literary expression by what standard we should measure it. To assert dogmatically that this is pure and that impure is ordinarily but to convict ourselves of being provincial, or at least philistine. Winterfeld suggests that modern poetesses of naturalism have quite equaled in frankness that Heloise whom they cannot forgive for preferring to be *Abailardi scortum et meretrix* rather than empress.[1] And I remember, after perusing certain novelettes and plays of *Grün-* and *Jüngstdeutschland*, that the most boisterous eighteenth-century English stories were penetrated by gales of fresh air, that the Elizabethan drama was fain to stop without the bedroom door. In the Benedictbeuern MS there is no Goethean *Tagebuch* with its recalcitrant Meister Iste, no Venetian epigram: "Hab ich als mädchen sie satt, dient sie als knabe mir noch." The sole sodomitic song in our codex spends itself in earnestly denying the guilt of its author.

There would be small reason, however, to raise, still less continue, discussion of this unsavory theme, if it were not that the materialism of the goliard songs appears in curious contrast to the almost finical reserve of the so-called *frauenlieder* of early *minnesang*,[2] with the Kürenberg women-strophes, with verses of Meinloh of Seflingen and of the Burggraf of Regensburg.[3]

Now this difference in attitude may mean any of three things: (1) that men wrote the Latin songs, women composed the German ones; (2) that the goliards were morally oblique, the German poets of spiritual mold; (3) that the two sets of authors were subservient to different literary conventions. Let us see.

[1] Cf. *Herrigs Archiv*, Vol. CXIV, p. 44, where Winterfeld draws an effective picture of the life of Irmgard von Hammerstein.

[2] One argument which has often been used to negate woman's authorship of lyric verses can scarcely be applied here. This is the assertion that no woman would give public expression to her love for a member of the sterner sex, as this would necessarily expose her to ridicule and social distress; cf., e. g., von Wilamowitz, *Göttinger Nachrichten* (1896), p. 225, note 2; Winterfeld, *loc. cit.*, p. 28. This of course would be only true, (1) if the author's name became known, (2) if the sentiments expressed were believed to be the direct outgrowth of the mood of the writer, and not as commonly in poetry the more or less conventionalized treatment of a tender theme. Moreover, hasty generalizations as to the etiquette forbidding female authorship are often invalid because one age or one given usage does not furnish necessary analogy to other times and other views.

[3] "On the part of the clerk sensuality, frivolity, an overbrimming pagan joy in life," says Scherer when discussing "der junge Spervogel" (*Deutsche Studien*, p. 7), "on the part of the layman moral earnestness and Christian sobriety." Again (p. 68) Scherer speaks of the secret revelations of a tender soul-life current in early *minnesang*.

More than forty years ago Müllenhoff asserted that the Kürenberg strophes were undeniably written by women, and Scherer thereafter announced that we might believe women alone capable of the profounder sentiments of love found in the earlier love-poetry of Germany.[1] These statements, which for some time have been regarded by scholars with apathy, if not distrust, have received fresh impetus at the hands of Breysig.[2] There are several reasons for assigning the authorship of such pieces to the other sex: (*a*) the testimony of chronicles and council decrees; (*b*) such evidence as we gain from *artes dictamini* and epistolary guides; (*c*) statements made in the poem itself; (*d*) a belief that in times of violence and rudeness the tenderest tones should be considered feminine. The first testimony (*a*), gathered as it is quite exclusively from other times and districts than the one under consideration and therefore without necessary application to the period we are dealing with, should be given no weight.[3] The next contention (*b*) is equally invalid, for popular as we know "compendiums for letter-writers" and "rhymsters" to have been in the Middle Ages, we should still hesitate to accept the purely typical figures of women authors that we find in them as derived from real life. Their source appears more naturally to rest in the rhetorical subtleties of the schools which made so much of them.[4] Third (*c*), there is

[1] Müllenhoff-Scherer, *Denkmäler* (1863); cf. *Preussische Jahrbücher*, Vol. XVI, pp. 267 ff.; Vol. XXXI, pp. 488 ff.; *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XVII, pp. 561 ff.; *Deutsche Studien* (1891)[2], pp. 69, 77 f.; *Gesch. d. d. Dichtung im xi. u. xii. Jhdt.*, p. 72. Kögel (*Pauls Grundriss*[2], Vol. II, p. 179) says: "Yearning for the absent love, grief at estrangement from him, find in these songs such simple and natural expression that one might decide for feminine authorship, did not the poets of this time in very similar pieces expressly introduce the woman as first speaker, and did not Kürenberger himself now and then betray the man's point of view in his portrayal of woman's emotions." Nor must we forget that "pathos was a strong solvent in the Middle Ages . . . . when the world was full of ideals and fantasies" (Ker, *Essays on Mediaeval Literature* [1905], p. 17), and so be not misled by the Kürenberg songs as we come to them perhaps straight from our study of the preceding epic literature which bristles with swords and battle-axes.

[2] Cf. *Die Zukunft* (1903), No. 27, in which Breysig utilizes the chaplain Andreas' *Tractatus de amore et amoris remediis* (written about 1170–85), and *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, Vol. I (1903), pp. 18 ff.: "the noble lady of the period knew how to read and write love-letters, a faculty that was probably often beyond the reach of her lover. But that the woman was first to begin striving to perfect sentiment and demeanor finds its reason in her innermost being, etc." General statements of this stripe based upon arbitrary psychological assumption cannot prove that women definitely composed certain poems.

[3] Cf. *Denkmäler* (1892)[3], Vol. II, pp. 154 f.

[4] A case in point is furnished by the partially rhymed love-letter of Tegernsee which ends in quoting "Du bist min, ich bin din" (cf. *Minnesangs Frühling* (1888)[4], pp. 221 ff.). Here we meet the situation which is such a commonplace in mediaeval poetry: a woman hesitates

no occasion to trust the autobiographic value of poetic utterance unless we have the added support of other knowledge regarding its author.[1] And the last point (*d*), because it may never be proven by any, is only assertive and quite without scientific warrant.[2]

Viewed from the standpoint of their songs alone, we have then no good reason to suppose the goliards more depraved than the minnesingers, unless we would regard their poetry as a matter of personal sincerity and not one of conventional pose,[3] unless we see fit to assert that their verses are "instantaneous photographs of immediate experience." But if we wish to raise our eyebrows over Astrophel's Stella, if we would make flesh and blood of Shakespeare's Dark Lady, there is none to forbid our doing the like with the punks and drabs of goliard tradition.[4]

between a soldier and a clerk as lover; cf., e. g., Matthew of Vendôme, *Epistolae*, II, 1 and 2 (Wattenbach, *Sitzungsber. d. bayr. Akad.* (1872), pp. 594 ff.); Love-Council of Remiremont (*Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. VII, p. 160); the debate between Phyllis and Flora (*Carmina burana*, No. 65), *Frigidum est horridum* (*ibid.*, No. 55), and the two French songs cited by Hubatsch (*Lat. Vagantenlieder*, pp. 26 f.). A mere glance at any of these passages does away with the theory that women really wrote this style of thing: it is all the purest casuistry. Matthew's lady, for instance, denies that physical beauty precludes chastity, acknowledges that she desires to marry, hints that she cares to be no one's paramour, but is of the opinion that if she does consent to a liaison it will be a layman and no clerk who profits by it. Insincere this is, of course, but necessarily no more so than the pose of that other Tegernsee lady who makes a love-billet of a *schnaderhüpfel*. The "du bist min" couplet need not be the work of a woman. Its sentiment is no more real than the device wrapped about any bonbon, than the motto printed in red on a peppermint heart. This children's party sort of jingle, "locked thou art within my heart, and I have lost the key," scholars have found tender and artless to a degree—and therefore feminine. It may be. But I had always imagined such things as "honey is sweet and so are you" gotten up by a designing confectioner to sell his sugar.

[1] The argument from lyric to life and then from life right back to lyric is a famous *circulus vitiosus*. The fray will never end, for on the one side stand those extremists who trust any record of the past which they would never think of believing in the present—a lyric record for example; on the other side are ranged the literal people who are taught to view with suspicion any exercise of the imagination whatsoever. Midground is taken by Burdach in his reasonable analysis of Walther's lyrics; his argument should be examined with some care by anyone interested in this general topic (cf. his *Walther v. d. V.* [1900], pp. 29 ff.).

[2] Mr. Manly reminds me of Skeat's pronouncement that the Nutbrown Maid was the product of a woman's art, despite the concluding lines.

[3] Even another source of our 'knowledge' in the matter of the 'brutish' poetry assigned to the goliards is not thoroughly trustworthy: the synodical decrees, the church historians, and the capitularies dictated by priests and monks. For these have an evident personal bias and a forced bitterness of denunciation that stamps them as the result of party clamor and ascetic dogmatism. If we believe such a diatribe as the *De contemptu mundi* of Bernard of Morlaix to be the mirror of the society of his age, then (and only then) can we put faith in much of the vituperation against the wandering students.

[4] Symonds could not refrain from rapping the goliards for their fancied sins. He says (*Wine, Women and Song*, p. 174): "The love of Tristram for Iseult, of Lancelot for

Suppose for the time being we admit these highly colored smudges to be true, then we must grant the like of the *edelfrauen* of *minnesang*. This wife, never the poet's own, the courtly author pictures for us according to a set of carefully laid down rules; he varies from the prescription given him as little as does your modern registered pharmacist.[1] She is wholly bound by convention. Nor is this strange, for German *minnesang* was from its first inception not folk-poetry but the class-poetry of

Guinevere, of Beaumains for his lady, is alien to the goliardic conception of intersexual relations. Nowhere do we find a trace of Arthur's vow imposed upon his knights: never to do outrage, and always to do ladies, damsels, and gentlewomen succour upon pain of death. This manly respect for women, which was, if not precisely the purest, yet certainly the most fruitful social impulse of the Middle Ages, receives no expression in the *Carmina vagorum*.

"The reason is not far to seek. The clerici were a class debarred from domesticity, devoted in theory to celibacy. In practice incapable of marriage, they were not so much unsocial or anti-social as extra-social; and while they gave a loose rein to their appetites, they respected none of those ties, anticipated none of those home pleasures, which consecrate the animal desires in everyday existence as we know it. One of their most popular poems is a brutal monastic diatribe on matrimony, fouler in its stupid abuse of women, more unmanly in its sordid imputations, than any satire which emanated from the corruption of imperial Rome."

If these remarks were only those of a single admirable and intrepid critic they might be passed over unheeded, but they present the general view; the view at least of all who read directly from mediaeval poetry to mediaeval social life. Symonds finds "the most fruitful social impulse" of a time in the woman worship of its romances; he finds in the goliards, on the contrary, "the cynicism which emerges in the lyrics of triumphant seducers and light lovers." If we should read modern records of this kind with equal seriousness, how strange would oftentimes be our deduction. No bay tree has ever flourished as do in these parlous days two sets of romances: the swashbuckling tale of the chaste youth who flies to the aid of distressed womanhood and thereby wins to wife wealth, rank, and beauty; the *chronique scandaleuse* of sensuality and degraded passion. These are our "Arthur" stories, our "goliard" songs. But they do not cut deep into our life, nor do they mirror it. Such "best sellers" are a species of vegetable growth and their roots are not watered by the blood that gives us strength. They do not wring our withers. They do not clothe our ideals. *Rollwagenbüchlein* are they, "train literature" to induce forgetfulness between stations or make possible slumber under the adverse conditions which govern hotel and sleeping-car. We enjoy them most when they do not in any way remind us of a life we have led or care to dream of leading.

I will not say that this was just the mediaeval state of mind toward all its romances and its naked literature of love. I do not know. But it is certainly as reasonable to believe twelfth-century men and women unharried by many fourth-rate courtly romances and "poems of passion" as are we.

[1] The portrait of the lady can be secured either by first-hand study of the poems themselves or more conveniently from such repertoria as Rosières, *Histoire de la société française au moyen âge* (1880), Schultz, *Das höfische Leben zur Zeit der Minnesänger* (1889)[2]. The following sketch is adapted from Breysig, *Archiv f. Kulturgesch.*, Vol. I, p. 21: The lady of course is always fair and of inviolate breeding, she walks with slow and mincing step, "gestreichet als ein velkelin, dem sin gefider eben lit," she must keep her gaze lowered, not be seen abroad unless muffled in a cloak, not swing her arms or gather her skirts about her. She must not cross her legs when she sits, she may smile but never laugh or speak loudly. Even when riding she must hide her hands under her garment. She may not address a strange man, but is to rise whenever he enters the room. And so on. One might believe himself in the drawing-room of a modern finishing school.

court and "society." Even before it became a fixed and fast literary mold, even if it derived at the beginning largely from a precedent popular native lyric and did not take its rise in Latin or Provençal or French or oriental writing, it yet breathed forth the new breath in literature of a devoted and soulful love. As platonic affection had its origin in the neo-platonism of the Italian renaissance, as anacreontic love is the reflex of an idyllic poetry revived from the pastorals of Theocritus and Anacreon, so—of course—the faithful swain and his finical lady were the result throughout twelfth- and thirteenth-century Europe of chivalry and the crusades.

Lyrical convention thus holds court poet and goliard alike, and each sings a little as the spirit moves him, but mostly within given and definite bounds. Except for an occasional piece here and there—and they are comparatively few in number—our hearts need not be troubled by this vivid epicureanism. It is not *flammen*, it is *poesie*. Certain Latin lyrical ballads, certain longer musical narratives show forth a glory and a ruthless abandonment of self that one is not accustomed to look for in Europe anywhere before the fourteenth century. They are big, they have effrontery, and preach pleasant surrender to the world without conscience and without qualm. They are "pagan," if you will. But this love for the detail of physical beauty, of woman's fleshly charm, is much more apt to be a direct inheritance from classical tradition than a newborn voluptuousness. In his *Planctus naturae* Alanus of Lille describes the goddess as follows:[1]

She is a virgin whose hair radiant with a peculiar brightness seems to invest her head with a starry halo. Her broad projecting forehead vies in color with the lily, her brows preserve a golden mean between luxuriance and sparseness, the soft serenity of her eyes with their benign glance resembles a double-star. Her nose is neither too depressed nor does it jut forth unduly, her mouth breathes sweet fragrance, her lips with their gentle swelling invite kisses, her teeth are ivory. A rosy glow is on her cheeks, her chin is crystal-smooth her throat is not slender nor yet short, her breasts display the gracefulness of youth, her arms incite embraces, the temperate curving of her hips completes the beauty of her figure.

[1] I quote from Francke, *Zur Gesch. d. lat. Schulpoesie*, p. 31. Read also what he has to say of similar passages from Nigel Wireker and Geoffrey of Vinesauf.

Here is the conventionalized formula for woman's beauty in the school-poem; plodding investigation of her parts from tip to toe. Churchmen, as we have seen, avoided the imputation of carnal longing by adding to their verses imagery gained from hymns to the Virgin and by taking refuge in phrases borrowed from the canticles and Prudentius; the goliards clung rather to Ovid[1] and sought to give their feminine lay-figure the color of truth by variation on the original model. The thread of it all, however, is in the classics, as are the omnipresent palace-descriptions of one kind and another, the portrayal of the goddesses Fame and Fortune,[2] etc.

The new thing that the goliards brought to this sort of school-poetry, a thing that gave life and the air of realism to it, that infused it with human warmth and sympathy was *song*. The greater poems existent at the French schools were narratives, with epic diffuseness of detail, made to be declaimed, prepared with elaborate labor, and spiced with subtle allusion for a learned audience. But the goliards with wares to sell set their store by clarity and simpler phrasing. Stolen hymns and folk-tunes furnished the musical background into which their words must fit, and the end of the story must come before breath and auditors were quite gone. Music, therefore, together with the changed nature of the audience to which they catered on their travels, accounts, I believe, for the broader colors in which woman was painted in the goliard songs, quite as much as a superadded lustfulness of spirit.

It is the accepted convention in all goliardic poetry first as last that men and maids are gifted with an omnipresent animalism:

Si puer cum puellula
Moraretur in cellula,

[1] For suggestive reference to Ovid's influence upon school-poetry, cf. Bartsch, *Albrecht von Halberstadt und Ovid im Mittelalter* (1861); Heinrich, *Quatenus carminum Buranorum auctores veterum Romanorum poetas imitati sunt* (1882); Paris, *Chrétien Legouais et les autres traducteurs ou imituteurs d'Ovide* (in *Hist. litt. de la France*, Vol. XXIX. (1885), pp. 455–525, cf. also his *La poésie du moyen âge* (1887), pp. 189 ff.; Wattenbach, *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XXXIV (1890), pp. 270 ff.; Vol. XVIII (1875), pp. 124 ff.; Reichling, *Monumenta Germaniae paedagogica*, Vol. XII (1893), pp. xix, xxvii; Manitius, "Beiträge zur Geschichte des Ovidius im Mittelalter" (*Philologus*, supplementary Vol. VII (1899), pp. 721–58). See Brandt, *De Arte amatoria libri tres* (1902), p. 204; Pascal, "I carmi medievali attribuiti ad Ovidio," *Poesia latina medievale* (1907), pp. 91–146; other titles may be found in Sandys' *History of Class. Scholarship* (1905), pp. 614 ff.

[2] Cf. Francke, *op. cit.*, pp. 27 f. A convenient collection of classical instances may now be found in Sypherd, *Studies in Chaucer's House of Fame* (Chaucer Society, 1907).

Felix conjunctio
Amore succrescente
Prodit e medio:
Fit ludus ineffabilis
Membris lacertis labiis.[1]

Not only is this true in those pieces which offer us a bald and unvarnished presentation of facts, but also in the slighter poems which content themselves with a delicate suggestiveness. Under the thin veneer of platonic affection and playfulness which masks Latin songs modeled on French pastourelles we read clearly the same materialism:

Quae respondet verbo brevi
"Ludos viri non assuevi;
Sunt parentes mihi saevi:
Mater longioris aevi
Irascetur pro re levi:—
Parce nunc in hora!"[2]

But apart from goliard poetry and from vernacular court-poetry we discover in certain Latin lyrics of a more popular sort an entirely different treatment of the theme of love than any we have yet discussed. I shall not call it necessarily more "chaste," nor sometimes perhaps less artificial, than the other two sorts. Still, the attitude such lyrics maintain toward the communion of the sexes is colored neither by sensuality nor by the forced abstemiousness of chivalrous lovers. In these popularizing Latin songs love is a thing in the world like the air and the sky and springtime, *weiter nichts*. One does not hold disquisitions as to its essence, nor does one stop particularly to apostrophize it. Why should one?

[1] *Carmina burana*, No. 144; *Gaudeamus*, p. 116; Symonds, *Wine, Women and Song*, p. 117.

[2] Symonds catches the note of this in his translation:

But the girl made answer then:
"Never played I yet with men;
Cruel to me are my kin:
My old mother scolds me when
In some little thing I stray:—
Hold, I prithee sir, today!"

Other notable instances of this suggestive platonism are Nos. 63, 119, 120, and particularly 61 with its uncomfortable stanza:

Ludo cum virginibus,
Horreo corruptas,
Et cum meretricibus
Simul odi nuptas;
Nam in istis talibus
Turpis est voluptas.

If the macaronic pastourelles, Nos. 145 and 146, seem more indecent than this, the difference is one of expression and not one of fact.

And this attitude we must call popular, for it springs from neither monastery, school, sodality of students, nor from knightly convention. It comes from the *volkslied*, or at least from the more humble and racial art which is largely untroubled by the cosmopolitan impulses which are influencing the cultured poetry of the favored classes.

We have already spoken of the admirable simplicity of a stanza of No. 51; other examples of such effective directness can be found in sufficient abundance in our manuscript. I can cite but a few:

Amaveram prae ceteris
Te, sed amici veteris
Es jam oblita, superis
  Vel inferis
Ream te criminamur. (No. 35.)

Naught may better illustrate the mosaic art of goliard poetry than the presence of such jeweled verses as these in the learned and artificial environment of a piece like *Captus amore gravi.*

Fronde nemus induitur,
Jam canit philomena,
Cum variis coloribus
Jam prata sunt amoena.
  Spatiari dulce est
  Per loca nemorosa;
  Dulcius est carpere
  Jam lilium cum rosa;
  Dulcissimum est ludere
  Cum virgine formosa.[1] (No. 103.)

Floret silva nobilis
Floribus et foliis.
  Ubi est antiquus
  Meus amicus?
  Hinc equitavit,
  Eia!
  Quis me amabit? (No. 112.)

[1] The last six lines of this stanza were apparently quite popular for we meet them often in one form and another, e. g.:

Dulce cum sodalibus
Sapit vinum bonum;
Osculari virgines
Dulcius est donum;
Donum est dulcissimum
Lyra seu Maronem.

—*Gaudeamus*, p. 74; *Ubi sunt*, p. 64.

Veris dulcis in tempore
Florenti stat sub arbore
Juliana cum sorore.
Dulcis amor!
Qui te caret hoc tempore
Fit vilior.
Si tenerem quam capio
In nemore sub folio,
Oscularer cum gaudio. (No. 121.)

Love treated in this everyday manner, I say, comes from the *volkslied.* I do *not* say that such lays as these just printed were themselves popular songs, or that they are plaster casts made from any particular *volkslied.* On the other hand, I do not contend that any particular popular song on which we can or cannot lay our hands comes directly from one of these Latin spring-poems. I view unmoved the fact that No. 112 is followed in the Benedictbeuern MS by a German song almost its counterpart:

Gruonet der walt allenthalben:
Wa ist min geselle alselange?
Der ist geritten hinnen,
Owi, wer sol mich minnen!

Nor should I try to establish any empirical law based upon a like resemblance between other Latin and German pieces such as Nos. 115, 115*a*:

Aestas non apparuit
Praeteritis temporibus
Quae sic clara fuerit;
Ornantur prata floribus,
Aves nunc in silva canunt
Et canendo dulce garriunt.

Ich gesach den sumer nie,
Daz er so schone duhte mich:
Mit menigen blumen wol getan
Diu heide hat gecieret sih,
Sanges ist der walt so vol,
Diu zit diu tut den chleinen vogelen wol.

Correspondences in meter and theme, verbal identity even, are not always safe criteria in the study of this perplexing codex, if we insist on developing the theory that the Latin poems were neces-

sarily either the models or the copies of the German pieces. One thesis was upheld by Martin, the other by Bartsch, Scherer, Burdach, Becker, and Wallensköld.[1] Both contentions, however, break down because the evidence is at once insufficient and contradictory. But we may learn from the presence of popularizing Latin lyrics in the *Carmina burana* that a German lyric existed before *minnesang* and that it was paralleled and preceded by a Latin lyric.

III. TREATMENT OF NATURE

Some years ago Marold gave currency to a tale which takes rank with the *Kinder- und Hausmärchen* of the brothers Grimm. For the lack of a better title it may be called "Wie die Deutschen auszogen den natursinn zu lernen." It runs as follows:

> Older German poetry offers astonishingly little expression of feeling for nature and exhibits small inclination to poetic imagery. In these respects the Germans won but gradually a greater freedom of spirit and not till the twelfth century do we find a total change. At this epoch there began to be felt an increased necessity for the poetic adornment of life and connected with this there must be, of course, a greater attention paid to nature, the phenomena of which had ever exercised an attraction for minds that were poetically inclined. There was, besides, the example of the western neighbors and of Latin poetry, which like the Latin language we know possessed international importance during the Middle Ages. Now people remembered in Germany, emboldened by such example, that in their own home, as well, hearts were beating higher when spring and its gifts were celebrated, that surely enough old popular-rhymes were still current which extolled the change of seasons. And in Germany, too, sentiment for nature was united with other emotions of the heart, especially with love.[2]

I have given this long quotation from Marold in no spirit of mockery, but because it seems to me inherently no more untrue in its mechanical literalness than the directly opposite view-point which discovers *à la* Biese living significance and deep spiritual meaning in every tag of threadbare nature-formalism used by

[1] Cf. Martin, *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XX (1876), pp. 46–69; Bartsch, *Deutsche Liederdichter des xii. bis xiv. Jahrhunderts* (1864); Scherer, *Deutsche Studien* (1874), No. II; Burdach, *Reinmar der Alte und Walther von der Vogelweide* (1880); Becker, *Der altheimische Minnesang* (1882); Wallensköld, *Helsingfors mémoires*, Vol. I (1893), pp. 71 ff.

[2] Cf. *Zeitschr. f. deut. Phil.*, Vol. XXIII (1890), p. 1; *Nord und Süd*, Vol. LII (1890), p. 334; *Verhandlungen deutscher Philologen* (1890), p. 256.

poetry.[1] The mere presence of nature in verse does not necessarily argue deep feeling for nature on the part of the versifier; if it does, let us recall with a start and a catch of the breath that some of the most artificial school-made poems that the world has ever known must be tremendously sincere in this one regard. But on the contrary critics like Marold err, I think, when they paint a scene like the above, and have the German remember suddenly that he needs some nature-tags, go to the western neighbors and to Latin poetry to get it, and fetch it home to unite it more or less seamlessly with other heart-emotions like love. As if one recalled that there were no chops for luncheon and hied him to the nearest shop to repair the oversight![2]

There is a golden mean to observe in this as in other matters. Goliard songs like *minnelieder* exhibit nature-sense, of course, or they would not so constantly refer to nature; a deep feeling for nature finds in either type but rare expression. The goliard as a usual thing paints his nature broad and pompously, whereas the earlier minnesingers at least sketch it more briefly and severely, but in final analysis each is ordinarily only following the technique of his school; the one clips his illustrations from Latin poems colored by Latin ecclesiasticism and scholastic rhetoric, the other gains his material from vernacular sources. Sometimes, however, the goliard is evidently influenced by popular poetry—at other times the minnesinger quite as openly finds his model in stilted Latin imagery. In any particular instance the reader of a poem may decide as to the real feeling for nature shown by some individual poet only after much personal examination of the records. He may discover the nature-introduction and embellishment so widespread in mediaeval poetry[3] to be but the veriest common-

[1] Biese, *Die Entwicklung des Naturgefühls im Mittelalter und in der Neuzeit* (1892)[2].

[2] An important bibliography of older writings on the nature-sense of the minnesingers in Meyer, *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XXIX (1885), p. 207. To furnish a general bibliography of this subject is happily unnecessary, for it would prove as arduous (and acceptable) a task as counting the hairs of one's head.

[3] We know how common a custom it was to enliven even the rhymed chronicles (the prose ones, too, for that matter) with various sorts of purely incidental matter; mythological allusions and reminiscences of ancient history vied in popular favor with descriptions of natural scenes and constituted a kind of broidered edge about the more solid framework of the theme. Just as, for example, Walter of Chatillon interlarded his *Alexandreis* with rhetorical pictures of nature according to good classical usage, so William the Breton

place of conventional symbolism,[1] the rewhistling, as it were, of a melody that is on every lip—or he may find in occasional lines of some Walther von der Vogelweide and his lesser brethren an adequate answer to the moment under description.

The nature-formalism of German *minnesang* has been graphically presented by several scholars, most notably by Richard M. Meyer; no similar classification on a large scale with reference to Latin school lyrics yet exists. Not until the material has been thus fully exposed, however, will it be commonly understood how much a child of the schools the goliard is in this regard. The labor of bringing together all the evidence bearing upon the treatment of nature in Latin school poetry would minimize by comparison *olim Herculis sudorem*,[2] but it would be well worth the while, for it would show that in hundreds of cases where we today assert originality exists, nothing but pedantic copying is manifest. As there is no space here for epic diffuseness a few known illustrations must suffice:

The opening lines of the *Synodicus* of Warnerius Basiliensis exhibit a joy in environing nature that would remind us of early *minnesang:*

Jam calor aestivus fervente leone nocivus
Transiit, augusti finis dat pocula musti.
Campis detectis et pomis arbore lectis
Undique potatur contractaque cura fugatur.
Nos quoque laetantes dum sustinet herba cubantes
Ramis protectos esca potaque refectos
Condelectemur . . . .

proved an apt pupil by interspersing here and there in his *Philippis* what seem to be individualized pictures of local scenery, until we remember the source of them is more apt to be Vergil or Ovid than the real experience of the author.

[1] If we take but one single symbol of natural beauty in mediaeval poetry like the rose, and with the aid of Joret's *La rose dans l'antiquité et au moyen âge* (1892) attempt a full classification of its literary sources, the result is not only instructive but bewildering. We see at once that goliardic poetry found scarcely a figurative use of this flower which classical and patristic Latin had not rendered commonplace. Christian mysticism broadened and specialized this imagery somewhat, of course, and hymnody painted new roses for its Mary-worship, but even here we can often trace easily the "pagan" original, or find at least that the mediaeval symbol has been anticipated by a writer like Prudentius. Such correspondences must frequently be ascribed to coincidence, no doubt, but never without some prior hesitation. For much of the Latin poetry of the Middle Ages was so essentially a poetry of the schools, a product of erudition and not an independent creation, that even in the songs of the wandering students the apparently fresh feeling for nature which inspires them is apt to be couched in tropes borrowed from textbooks.

[2] "For who of all these poets has not sung or described spring?" asks Francke (*op. cit.*, p. 63).

if we did not know they were copied from Theodulus.[1] Similarly, the following verses from a poem of Nigel Wireker would appear to be an individual tribute of some merit, if we did not understand them to be little more than a cento made from a score of school-descriptions of spring. Every phrase of Nigel's picture can be reproduced again and again from goliard poetry; most of it could be put together in a moment from the songs of the *Carmina burana* alone; it is minstrel patter of a learned sort:

Postquam tristis hiems zephyro spirante recessit,
Grando, nives, pluviae consuluere fugae,
Terra parens florum vires rediviva resumpsit,
Exeruitque caput exhilarata suum,
Ver caput atque comes aestatis in otia curas
Laxat, et ablato frigore flore nitet.
Vernat fronde nemus, vestitur gramine tellus,
Veris odoriferi spirat ubique vapor.
Quidquid hiems hyemisque graves rapuere ministri,
Reddidit aestatis gratia vere novo.
Veris ad imperium surgens statione soluta,
Clausa sub aestivo carcere cedit hyems.
Flante levi zephyro dum ver lascivit in herbas,
Aestas multiplici flore maritat humum.
Temporis atque loci facie redeunte serena,
Saltibus et silvas redditur exul avis;
Quaeque diu siluit philomena silentia solvit,
Voce sua redimens verba negata sibi.
Cujus ad exemplum, sterili torpore remoto,
Morem temporibus qui gerit ipse sapit.[2]

Again, we have in the initial verses of the *Apocalypsis Goliae* what shines forth as an individualized depiction of a spring landscape: "In the month of May when the sun burned hot I betook myself to a shady grove and was resting under a spreading oak, when suddenly the form of Pythagoras appeared." Localization, however, promptly disappears when we recall practically this identical statement from a dozen other sources.[3]

[1] Cf. Huemer, *Romanische Forschungen*, Vol. III, pp. 315 ff.; *Wiener Studien*, Vol. XIV (1892), pp. 156 ff.

[2] Francke (*op. cit.*, p. 63) cites a similar passage from another poem of Nigel, and also Geoffrey of Vinesauf's *Poetria*, vv. 550 ff., 901 ff.; Arnulf (Lexoviensis, *Opera*, ed. Giles) pp. 35, 37; the *Anticlaudianus* and *Planctus naturae* of Alanus of Lille; Peter of Eboli, vv. 1465 ff.

[3] Cf. Böhmer, "Herdringer Vagantenliedersammlung," *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XLIX (1907), pp. 202 f.; also another poem (No. 17) of the same collection; Radewin's verses, *Sit-*

And so we might proceed with our presentation of the other clichés of nature description which goliard verse possesses in such abundance, adding largely to the material already garnered by Richard M. Meyer and Marold. The stock personifications of nature as the force that created anew, as the pregnant mother, the one perfect healer, the asylum of refuge, the supreme manifestation of a higher being, now malignant, now kindly, etc., until the whole rote of classical reminiscence and school-lore had been sung. But there is no need of this in the present instance, for we wish merely to establish sufficiently the fact that the cachet of goliardic verse like that of all school-poetry is that it found in nature "an object of contemplation rather than an impulse to emotion, a subject for moral rather than for aesthetic interpretation."

The simple Latin pieces, on the other hand, those which preceded, paralleled, and copied German dance rhymes, betray all the immediateness of experience which is the unfailing criterion of folksong.[1] In No. 79, refrain, the poet does not study the world, he *hears* it and it is sounding a thousand melodies of love; No. 81, the choir of song-birds incites to youthful dalliance; No. 99, the new beauty of spring and its festival array summon to gaiety, but the girl should be true to the lover who is ever with her in thought (*von dir geschieden, bin ich bei dir*); No. 100, men and maids with crowns of roses go out into the meadows now that spring has come again; No. 103, it is good to walk in the woodlands now that the trees are green with foliage, etc. A hundred similar quotations can be had for the asking from the two-score light and graceful love *dits* which intervene between Nos. 100 and 147 of the *Carmina burana*.

What may we read from this? That all these songs were composed by simple-minded folk-poets? Of course not. That the majority of these songs are absolutely untouched by the long-

zungsber. d. bayr. Akad. [1873], p. 690; Fierville, *Notices et extraits*, Vol. XXXI (1884), Pt. 1, p. 144, Hauréau, *Notices et extraits*, Vol. VI (1893), p. 289; Hubatsch, *op. cit.*, p. 60; Raab, *Ueber vier allegorische Motive in der latein. u. deut. Lit. d. Mittelalters* (1885); Francke, *op. cit.* p. 58, who also cites in this connection the *Palponista* of *Bernard of Gest.*

[1] Although it must not be forgotten that in these pieces as in popular poetry everywhere nature is only the background and is generally sketched without individuality of tone or treatment. "In the landscapes of goliardic literature," says Symonds, "there is nothing specific to a single locality, no name like Vaucluse, no pregnant touch that indicates one scene selected from a thousand."

breathed absurdities of the French and German schools? Again, of course not. We may, however, from the open page of these confessions read that *kranzsingen*, *brunnenfahrt*, *knappenehe*, *maienbuhlen* and other village festivals and customs live in these Latin lyrics as really as they do in any vernacular German poetry of the contemporary day. And this sort of come-be-my-valentine song with its set-piece of nature-staging (trees are green: the meadow is flow'ring: the nightingale sings: the spreading linden-branches invite)—shall we for one moment deem this identical in origin with the industriously wrought imagery of learned nature allusion? No. It matters not where the *volkslied*-landscape appears; whether in simplest maying couplets or in more pretentious company, viz., as a mere tag in a goliardic ballad; it can be recognized as readily as might a milkmaid at the court of Louis XIV. A real milkmaid it may be or some fine lady in masque, but the origin of the costume in either case betokens the source of the idea. The treatment of nature in some of the Latin spring-songs of the *Carmina burana* teaches us that there were German popular songs everywhere during the twelfth century, and that they are reflected in (and are at times the reflex of) popularizing Latin lyrics.

IV. CLASSICAL AND POPULAR ALLUSIONS

On first hearing the *Orlando furioso* the cardinal Ippolito of Este is rumored to have asked Ariosto in some surprise, "Master Ludovico, where *did* you find all that nonsense?" What answer the indignant poet made history does not relate, but his sources are sufficiently known to us, thanks to the unselfish labors of modern investigators.[1] If a mediaeval schoolman had been similarly examined as to the models of his poem, he would presumably have claimed much of it for his own, but again modern industry has unearthed many of the original writings which were the whole basis and scaffolding for the building of twelfth-century poems. And these were copied after, propped and buttressed by, decorated and painted with, and garnished from, the Latin classic authors. Sometimes the influence was direct, sometimes the ancient author was known through an intermediary of

[1] Cf. Gustav Meyer, *Essays und Studien*, Vol. I (1885), p. 208.

the Silver Age, of African Latinity, or of the Carolingian renaissance; but no matter how the original source be tarnished, made turbid, clouded, or disordered, in final essence it remains the life-giving cell.

The goliards inherited the literary tradition of both school and church.[1] The result of this, as has been sufficiently indicated above, is that their poems stand forth in sharp relief from the lay-poetry of the time—a contrast of which the goliards themselves were conscious, and which they did all in their power to maintain.[2] It is only necessary for one who is conversant with the recurrent formulae of German *minnesang* to glance at the more learned and pretentious of the Latin lyrics in the *Carmina burana* to recognize how different are the turns of speech which characterize the latter.

A long catalogue of these learned formulae is necessary and has never yet been made. I know of no other work in connection with the history of the mediaeval lyric so important at this time. Without such a *vorarbeit* literary criticism must continue to hand down general statements regarding the texture and the weaving of Provençal, French, German, English, and Italian lyrics as they meet our gaze from twelfth and thirteenth centuries onward. We must thresh and re-thresh the husks, until someone feels himself called to examine the field of Latin literature during the

[1] Cf. Hubatsch, pp. 22 f.: "Besides the Bible the Roman classics formed the foundation of the clerical culture of the Middle Ages. Thus there mingled in the poetic diction of the clerks the figures of Old and New Testament and the gods and heroes of Greece and Rome; parables and maxims from the Bible and sayings and proverbs from ancient authors; church mysteries and the mythology of antiquity. Because of the language of the church which the clerks spoke, they employed the tales and the persons of the Old Testament much as the Roman poets did the Greek legends and gods; Jerusalem and Zion commonly appear in the poetic diction of the church as a term for *ecclesia*, the Christians are called *plebs hebrea*, etc. On the other hand they speak of Homer, of Jupiter, of the Medes and Persians, as if they themselves were living in the age of the Roman poets." Because of this confusion of imagery, Jupiter often replaces the Christian God (e. g., in the *Confessio Goliae;* "sed cor patet Jovi"), and Venus is substitute for the Virgin Mary. For further suggestive discussion cf. Francke, pp. 33 ff.; Pannenborg, *Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte*, Vol. XI, p. 225; and especially Ronca, *Cultura medievale* (1891), pp. 126 ff., who calls attention to the *Goliae dialogus inter aquam et vinum* (Wright, *Walter Mapes*, p. 87; Novati, *Carmina medii aevi*, p. 58) in which Thetis and Lyaeus appear before the throne of God and plead their case with a large number of citations from the Bible.

[2] As many allusions indicate: "Laici non capiunt ea quae sunt vatis," "Literatos convocat decus virginale, laicorum execrat pectus bestiale," "Jacet ordo clericalis in respectu laicalis," "aestimetur autem laicus ut brutus, nam ad artem surdus est et mutus," etc.

early Middle Ages, in order to determine how much it may contain of the themes and the figures which vernacular poetry later employed. It requires no prophetic vision to see that in this Latin lies buried many a secret for which students of national and native poetic art have long been hunting, or which in their lack of full knowledge they believe to have found elsewhere. In some ways the task is an enormous one, for it should include not merely the examination of Latin school poetry but must search industriously through chronicles and sermons, prose treatises of many sorts, MSS of excerpts and apologues, exempla and tales, *artes dictamini et metrici*, religious and philosophical tracts, historical records. When the work has been finished, we shall find the truth of a fact which has often been discovered before: culture filters down to the more illiterate people from above, but the reaction is at least equally strong—the conscious and learned literature of the favored class everywhere mirrors the homely wisdom and the innate poetry of humbler souls, no matter how far from its original form and purpose such popular lore may have been brought by scholastic transfiguration.

Pending such investigation, however, we must be content to note the disparity of devices and tricks which separates goliard poetry from courtly lyrics as well as from poetry of the more popular sort. Because of the limits of our space one or two illustrations must suffice.

In one of Nigel Wireker's poems[1] the three Fates come upon a girl of such radiant beauty that Jupiter himself would have suffered banishment from heaven for seven years rather than give her up. This picture is repeated with more or less furbishing in school verse until it becomes a wearying commonplace. Geoffrey of Vinesauf, for example, writes:

> Si Jupiter illis
> Temporibus vidisset eam: nec in Amphitrionem
> Luderet Alcmenam; nec sumeret ora Dianae:
> Ut te fraudaret Callisto flore; nec Io
> Nube; nec Antiopam satyro; nec Agenore natam
> Tauro; Messione nec te pastore; vel agne

[1] Cf. Wright, *Anglo-Latin Satirical Poets*, Vol. II, p. 111; Francke, p. 32.

Asopo genitam; vel te Didonis in anguem;
Vel Ledam cygno; nec Danem falleret auro.
Hanc solam coleret, omnesque videret in una.[1]

This flourish is used three times by Hilary:

Si nunc certe regnaret Jupiter,
Pro puella bos factus turpiter,
Avis foret tibi similiter,
Apud illum ut fores jugiter.

Crede mihi, si redirent prisca Jovis saecula,
Ganimedes jam non foret ipsius vernacula;
Sed tu, raptus in supernis, grata luce pocula,
Gratiora quidem nocte Jovi dares oscula.

Nam et rector superorum,
Raptor olim puerorum,
Si nunc esset, tam decorum
Ad caeleste ferret torum
Aula tandem in superna,
Satis prontus ad alterna,
Nunc in toro, nunc pincerna,
Jovi fores gratus una;[2]

and oftener still in the *Carmina burana;* very simply in two cases, at other times with conscious elaboration:

Me Corinna Jove digna nexuit. (No. 154.)

Si me dignetur quam desidero,
Felicitate Jovem supero. (No. 167.)

Unde juro Musas novem,
Quodque majus est, per Jovem,
Qui pro Danae sumsit auri,
Pro Europa formam tauri. (No. 168.)

O si forte Jupiter hanc videat,
Timeo ne pariter incaleat
Et ad fraudes redeat,
Sive Danaes pluens antrum
Imbre dulci mulceat,
Vel Europes intret taurum,
Vel et haec congaudeat
Rursus in olore. (No. 56.)

[1] *Poetria nova*, vss. 621 ff.

[2] Cf. Champollion-Figeac, *Hilarii versus et ludi*, pp. 21, 22, 40.

Another picture of which the goliard never tires is that of the poet wounded by love.[1] Similar personifications of Fate and of Fortune are extremely common, like that of Nature of which we have already spoken. There is often scarcely an end to the heaping up of classical and biblical instances of wisdom, greatness, beauty, and chastity, even in really musical and lyric pieces: one has but to recall the *Ubi sunt* strophes or the "gloss" stanzas so beloved of mediaeval poets:

Inplumes aves volitant, Brunelli chordas incitant, boves in aula salitant, stivae praecones militant. In taberna Gregorius jam disputat inglorius, severitas Hieronimi partem causatur oboli. Augustus de segete, Benedictus de vegete sunt colloquentes clanculo et ad macellum sedulo. Mariam gravat sessio, nec Marthae placet actio, jam Liae venter sterilis, Rachel lippescit oculis. Catonis jam rigiditas convertitur ad ganeas, et castitas Lucretiae turpi servit lasciviae.[2]

Such examples may be multiplied at will, as may scores of other classical reminiscences of one sort and another. But enough has been said to show the trend of things in this direction; it remains to present the antithesis. For just as surely as the presence of such allusions as those above indicated show learned influence and environment in the case of certain songs, a large number of facts of a different kind furnish indisputable testimony regarding the popular nature and origin of other lyrics. These without further ado I shall now proceed to sweep together as well as may be.

Diction.—Richard M. Meyer has succeeded in winnowing out of the lighter lyrics of the *Carmina burana* a large number of Germanisms, many of which are of the simplest and most popular sort. Some of his examples are, as he himself recognizes, not absolutely convincing; that is, they may be French locutions as well as German ones; but in general his results in this direction have stood and will stand the severest test of criticism. *Late*

[1] Instances chosen at random from the *Carmina burana* are: Venus me telo vulneravit; Cupido telum minans vibrat; tela Cupidinis aurea gesto; vulneratus a sagitta Veneris; dum sagittam Veneris vos sentitis; vulnus atque vulneris causas revela; telum pectore clausum portitavi; dulce est hoc jaculo velle vulnerari; vulnera experior; vulneratus nequeo sanari; Venus tela proferat in amantes puellas; et aurea Cupidinis ad jacula; ob quam vulneror; venenea ob hoc amoris jacula; unius in amore puellae vulneror; amor telum est in signis Veneris; quod feriat me Veneris jaculo; vulneror in medio cordis mei telo; and many more.

[2] *Carmina burana*, No. LXIX.

pandit tilia, nu ist wol breit der linden ir ast; *flore decoratum purpureo*, mit rosen underwieret; *sed haec mihi penitus mors dulcior*, aber sanfter waere mir der tot; *ornantur prata floribus*, diu heide hat gezieret sich; *ver redit optatum cum gaudio*, komen ist ein wunneclicher meie, des kunft envreut sich; such formulae as these found in plenty among the dance songs of a Bavarian MS speak with no uncertain voice of the technique of German *volkslieder*.

Impure rhyme.—Pursuant to hints given by Wilhelm Meyer, Lundius discovers the songs in the *Carmina burana* which exhibit impurity of rhyme and those which sin against the doctrine of syllabic equality in verse structure to be chiefly German in origin. Gladly as I should accept the conclusions of Lundius to bolster up my argument, I cannot believe in their integrity at this time, for reasons elsewhere given.[1]

Themes.—Certain of the themes and the manner of treating them in Latin lyrics have been discussed in the preceding part of this study. I have practically nothing to add on this point, although the material at hand to prove popular German influence in a number of Latin songs which have not been treated is still ample. I have not used all this evidence, for it would offer nothing new except in the way of cumulative proof, and I have preferred to leave a topic the moment I believed it to be adequately set forth and verified.

Popular paraphrase.—German popular poetry has a fondness for concrete illustration which shows itself in minute details.[2] Abstract expressions of time and place are avoided by the *volkslied* whenever possible. For "always" it says "by night as well as day;" "never" is more graphically given by "when the ravens become white doves," "when the sea stands still," etc. We meet this tendency now and then, or at least the deliberate copying of it, in Latin verses:

> Cum mare siccatur
> Et daemon ad astra levatur,
> Tunc primo laicus
> Fit clero fidus amicus.[3]

[1] Cf. Appendix, *infra*. [2] Cf. Wackernell, *Das deutsche Volkslied* (1890), p. 27.

[3] An inscription on the church of St. Martin in Worms; Hubatsch, p. 22.

Ergo dum nox erit dies,
Et dum labor erit quies,
Et dum silva sine lignis,
Et dum aqua erit ignis,
Et dum mare sine velis,
Et dum Parthus sine telis,
Cara mihi semper eris;
Nisi fallar, non falleris.[1]

Impersonality.—Hubatsch says that the goliard songs are like *volkslieder* because they are the property of none, but pass like ready coins through the hands of many; because in them the personality of the poet is withdrawn, or what little there may be of it is soon sloughed off, and only that which is of universal interest and value remains; because goliard songs are current at one and the same time in different forms, of which it is difficult to determine the original, for in each new revision we find no longer the product of the individual, but the traces of many hands. These words of Hubatsch are not unreasonable, and for a small portion of goliardic poetry they may be exact and true, but personally and after much study of the situation I am afraid it is not well to insist strongly upon the likeness of goliard lyric to folksong in the matter of impersonality. For it offers us too vague and uncertain a clue to follow with satisfaction, and leads us almost of necessity to adopt the specious phrase "learned folk-poetry" to which I have above objected.

The courtly poets were the first to object to the theft of their songs ("dönedieb"); previous poets either took no heed of plagiarism and made no attempt to prove ownership to their lays, or —what is perhaps more likely—names have been lost to us through the carelessness and chance of transmission. From these facts we can read something of the literary fashions of a time, but we can hardly read a similarity to popular poetry. Some of the greatest hymns ever written are ascribed to this or that author on the basis of mere rumor and tradition, innumerable poems big and little,

[1] *Carmina burana*, No. 168; the phrase "Parthus sine telis" in a stanza of so popular a sort reminds us of the learned character of the *minnegruss* cited above (Part I, p. 14, bottom), which Mr. E. K. Rand discovers to contain a reminiscence of *Pervigilium Veneris*, vss. 47 f.

"comedies," tales, sermons, etc., likewise are without definitely ascertainable authors and have therefore been assigned one after the other to almost every new head that juts up above the mediaeval horizon. But in few of these cases surely would we think of comparing these things with *volkslieder* simply because they are anonymous.

And as for the general and impersonal nature of many goliard songs, they were written in Latin and so could not hope to achieve the specific individualization of vernacular poems. Besides which, they need not be regarded as "popular" simply because they did not insist upon the extravagant claims of the ego of the poet so characteristic of the songs of *minnedienst*.

Music.—It is possible for the scientist to deal with electricity without taking into consideration the lightning flash, and likewise we may treat long and laboriously of mediaeval Latin lyrics without a reference to mediaeval music. Songs that because of the accident of ink and print we *see*, others have *heard*, but all the melody which filled their ears is lost to us. I suspect that sometimes music carried lyrics like lightning from one land to another, from one tongue to another; only thus may I explain to my satisfaction the quickness with which certain forms of poetry appear to have found diffusion throughout Europe. At the present time a certain light opera is being heard in many cities and countries of our small world; it contains a waltz-song which is achieving widespread popularity and praise. For a little while the words of this song are being sung in at least five languages and on two continents. It will live out its ephemeral day and disappear; but what a crux the words of this song will offer to the "investigator" of some future century who vainly attempts to construct the meaning of their popularity and their wide diffusion! He will be confronted by a mummy which cannot be reawakened except through the miracle of music.

And there is something about the poorest mummy-casket which allows us to dream of life, nay which demands that we so dream. And so there is much in the simplest lyrics of the *Carmina burana* which tells us of the sound of them, which leads us to set them to one and another of the tunes from the modern *kommersbuch*

with some satisfaction to ourselves at least. A few of them may have been sung to tatters and thus have gained a terseness of expression, a crispness that we are accustomed to in *volkslieder* and in modern German popularizing lyrics but which contrasts oddly with the expressionistic tautology, the plethoric garrulousness of the longer Latin poems. A study of the refrains in the Benedictbeuern codex similarly convinces us of the popularity some songs achieved when set to a catching tune.

Terseness.—In his review of *Des Knaben Wunderhorn* Goethe speaks of the laconicism of the lyric which is the undoubted result of the vivid contemplation of a limited situation, of the pressure exerted by a deep view. I have just hinted that some of this crispness and tensity found in mediaeval Latin lyrics may be due to the circumstance of oral transmission; they have been *zersungen*, and nothing but the last intelligible rags of them remain. But in certain other short songs I believe we meet with that impressionistic vagueness of expression, that disregard for middle-terms, *sprunghaftigkeit*, *technik des erratenlassens*, which folk-poetry has ever used with such telling effectiveness. Not much of this is in our lighter ballads, it is true, but here and there if I mistake not there is a faint reflection of it; we should need far more material than we now have to justify prolonged exegesis, but on the other hand I do not feel like passing by the fact in silence. Just one citation:

> Beneath the spreading branches of this tree [said the girl] my knight has often descended from his horse and stopped to tell me of his love; though, alas, he was ever more prone to demand of me the pledges of my love for him! But now that he comes no more I yet steal away to our leafy meeting-place and strive to keep my faith for him and be ready when he next appears. Where does he tarry? Nay, he is faithless as I am fond, he has ridden off and will never plead again for my caresses. Oh, if this love has played me false, who is there that can love me?

All this the poet says and more still by implication, but after the manner of the *volkslied* he crowds it into a few words:

> Floret silva nobilis
> Floribus et foliis.
> Ubi est antiquus

Meus amicus?
Hinc equitavit;
Eia! Quis me amabit?

Refrains.—The choral stanzas of the love-lyrics in the *Carmina burana* fall into two easily distinguishable classes: (1) long and learned refrains;[1] (2) shorter ones with a more lyrical and popular tone. I feel no inclination to make a catalogue of these two sorts, for we should gain therefrom no new point of view. The first kind of refrain is bookish not only because of the nature of its content but because it is so difficult to learn and retain that we must suspect the singer of it to have constantly refreshed his mind with a glance at the page:

Experire filia virilia
Semper juvenilia stabilia;
Sola sunt senilia labilia.
Haec sunt utensilia agilia, facilia,
gracilia, fragilia, humilia, mobilia,
docilia, labilia, Caecilia,
Et si qua sunt similia.

Jolly a refrain though this may be, it defies facile memorization; nor may we easily suspect it to have been intercalated between the song of the two quatrains which it divides, for it fits the sense and the rhyme of them exactly. Now, while in the *Carmina burana* we have practically no other example of so extended and whimsical a chorus, there are a number of instances[2] which argue with equal force against the popularity of the poems which contain them—"popularity" in the sense of a widespread and almost unconscious humming of them. The presence of the longer refrain, then, merely indicates that more than one singer had part in the song—not that it was in any sense a *volkslied*.[3]

But the brief choral reiteration which characterizes certain of the shorter poems of love and wine, often with vernacular alloy, makes their popularity more or less certain; although in one or

[1] Wilh. Meyer is in error when he says the arranger of the Benedictbeuern codex made an especial rubric of those simple love-songs which have the longer refrains (*Ges. Abhandl.*, Vol. I, p. 326): Nos. 140-43, 145, 146. Other refrains in songs of this type like Nos. 53 and 59 exceed the ones he mentions by several lines.

[2] E. g.. Nos. 38, 48, 53, 54, 56, 57, 115, 140, 142, 144.

[3] Cf. what Wilh. Meyer has to say about No. 178 (*Ges. Abhandl.*, Vol. I, p. 327).

two cases (cf. No. 125) the refrain is slight and pretty, whereas the poem is stilted or long-winded.

No. 34: Fronde pausat tiliae, Cypridis in voto!
79: Audi bela mia, mille modos Veneris da hi zevaleria.
81: O vireat, o floreat, o gaudeat in tempore juventus!
88: Eia, qualia amoris gaudia!
92: Miser, miser! modo niger et ustus fortiter.
112: Floret silva undique, nah mine gesellen ist mir we.
121: Dulcis amor! Qui te caret hoc tempore fit vilior.
125: Lodircundeia lodircundeia.
136: Hyrca hyrce nazaza trillirivos.
143: Vos igitur, o socii, nunc militetis Veneri.
146: Hoi et oe! maledicantur tiliae juxta viam positae!
164: Temporis nos ammonet lascivia.
166: Amor improbus omnia superat, subveni!
182: Deu sal sit vobiscum, o pecharie! Modo bibite, sortes apponite!
191: O et o cum jubilo, largos laudet nostra concio.

To such a list should be added the German refrains appended to Latin pieces, for they teach the same lesson of popularity.

141: Manda liet, manda liet, min geselle chumet niet.
145: Heia heia, wie si sanch; cicha cicha, wie si sanch; vincula vincula vincula rumpebat.
181: Her wirt, tragent her nuo win, vrolich suln wir bi dem sin.

NATIVE ART IN DRINKING SONGS

I have already had occasion to speak of the bacchic songs which parodied religious poems.[1] Some of these copied the *Ave*-model closely, others like the hymn of *magister* Morandus developed the form further,[2] but they are all the fruit of learned imitation. In none of them can we trace any hint of nationality or birthplace, other than to assume that they had their origin in connection with festivals like the *festae stultorum* and *asinorum*.[3]

Another sort of drinking-song is without racial characteristics, This is the *conflictus* between wine and water.[4] In part it may

[1] Cf. Part I, p. 35.

[2] Cf. Mone, *Hymni latini medii aevi*, Vol. I, p. 177; Wright, *Early Mysteries*, p. 120; DuMéril (1847), p. 204, (1843), p. 96; *Anzeiger f. Kunde d. deut. Vorzeit*, Vol. XV, p. 135; *Chronica fratris Salimbene Parmensis* (1847), p. 92; Novati, *Carmina medii aevi* (1883), pp. 66, 69, *Studi critici* (1889), p. 186; Suttina, *Studi medievali*, Vol. II (1907), pp. 563 ff.

[3] Cf. Novati, *Studi critici*, pp. 185 ff.; Chambers, *Medieval Stage*, Vol. I, pp. 274 ff.

[4] Cf. also the "Altercatio vini et cerevisiae," *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XLIX (1907) p. 200.

be the outgrowth of the more popular type of eclogue and *streitgedicht*, but in any case it is so colored by learned reference and scholastic diction as to belong to the "universal" and "cosmopolitan" kind of mediaeval Latin poetry and to conceal all traces of its nativity. Various versions of this poem exist,[1] the fragmentary one in the *Carmina burana* (No. 173) being the shortest and most vivid of them all. It was extremely popular in the Middle Ages and has been ascribed to Golias, Archpoet, and Primate.

Certain metrical *sprüche* (proverbial verses) which deal with wine and water likewise betray no mark of their original home. The best known of these is the *In cratere meo Thetis est sociata Lyaeo* which is found in more than twenty MSS.[2] It seems now likely that Hugo of Orleans wrote these distichs or at least gave them currency in his time, but we may not be sure that he invented their theme. The same thought appears in several rhythmic pieces of the *Carmina burana* and was the catch of many a mediaeval German drinking-song, no doubt: *Reimt sich wasser nicht mit wein!* Always, however, in learned dress:

Cum in scypho reponuntur
Vinum, aqua, conjunguntur;
Talis conjunctio non est bona. (No. 173.)

Aqua prorsus coitum
Nequit impetrare,
Bachus illam facile
Solet expugnare. (No. 178.)

Nunquam Bachus adaquari
Se voluit,
Nec se Liber baptizari
Sustinuit. (No. 179.)[3]

But if we do not gain the scent of unforgettable *tafellieder für liedertafeln* in the types of wine-songs already suggested in

[1] Cf. Wright, *Walter Mapes*, p. 87; Grimm, *Kleinere Schriften*, Vol. III, p. 78; Salimbene (1847), p. 218; *Anzeiger f. Kunde*, Vol. XV, p. 285; DuMéril (1854), p. 303; Novati, *Carmina medii aevi*, p. 58; *Bibl. de l'École de chartes*, Vol. XLVII (1886), p. 2, etc.

[2] A comparative analysis of them is given by Meyer, *Göttinger Nachrichten* (1907), pp. 149 f.

[3] Cf. also the couplet

Qui aquam ponit in Falerno
Sit sepultus in inferno.

Studi medievali, Vol, II, p. 566.

this chapter, other poems afford us as rich indications of the vernacular and native art of Germany as any that we have found in Latin lyric dance-songs. The drinking-song *Meum est propositum*[1] cannot be cited in this connection for its parentage is not and perhaps never will be settled,[2] but again this poem would not be a case in point for us, as no matter how genial it may be it is part and parcel of a learned goliardic poem, and without locality of color. Nor, for like reasons, can we lay claim to the vulgar *Testamentum asini*[3] or such nobler products of the scholar's muse as the originals of *Gaudeamus igitur*, *Lauriger Horatius*, and *Dulce cum sodalibus*.[4] Clerical models, too, such as the antiphon of the "service for gamesters," *Ego sum abbas cucaniensis* and the stanza from an introit,

> Tunc rorant scyphi desuper,
> Et canna pluit mustum,
> Et qui potaverit nuper,
> Bibat plus quam sit justum,[5]

[1] Sandys' objection that these are the best known and most misunderstood verses of mediaeval poetry sounds strange in our ears; cf. *Cambridge History of Eng. Lit.*, Vol. I, p. 212. Even if these lines are an allusion to the grossness of Bishop Golias and not the personal conviction of the poet himself, how does that change matters? For a jovial song these verses have always been and always will be.

[2] Wilh. Meyer's direct attribution of the poem to "the veritable child of Cologne, the thoroughly misunderstood, most genial Latin poet of the Middle Ages" (*Fragmenta burana*, p. 21) is no more certain than the similar assignment of the *In cratere meo* which he has since discovered to belong to Hugo of Orleans. He who wishes the joy of studying all the redactions of this poem at once may turn to Werner, *Beiträge zur Kunde d. latein. Lit. d. Mittelalters*, pp. 200 ff.

[3] Cf. especially Feifalik, "Studien zur Gesch. d. altböhmischen Lit." (*Sitzungsber. d. Wiener Akad.*, Vol. XXXVI, No. II, p. 172), Palm, "Latein. Lieder aus schlesischen Kloster-Bibliotheken" (*Abhandlungen d. schles. Gesell.* (1862), No. II, p. 95), and Novati, *Carmina medii aevi*.

[4] The groundwork of these three notable songs is presumably to be found in originals of as early a date as the twelfth century. In his *Gaudeamus* (1879)[2] Peiper printed after the titles of the last two of the poems "Archipoetae vestigia" and later explained that he meant that they "as well as the *Gaudeamus igitur* rested on old foundations, and the forgotten old songs which underlay them were to be traced back to the archpoet and goliardic verse. Cf. von Bärnstein, *Ubi sunt qui ante nos* (1881), p. 138. Symonds likewise discovers that "their style is so characteristic of the Archipoeta, that I believe we may credit him with at least a share in their composition." *Wine, Women and Song*, p. 146. The bibliography concerning *Gaudeamus* is very extensive: it may be found conveniently in Bärnstein, pp. 103–12 and Kopp, *Deutsches Volks- und Studentenlied in vorklassischer Zeit* (1899); cf. also DuMéril (1847), p. 125; Klemming, "Latinska sånger från Sveriges medeltid." IV (*Cantiones morales scholast. hist. in regno Sueciae olim usit.* [1887], p. 16), and Enders, *Euphorion*, Vol. XI (1904), pp. 381–406.

[5] A parody of Isaiah's *rorate coeli desuper et nubes pluant justum*. Curiously enough this very line receives another witty twisting in Gerald of Barri's tale of the Englishwoman who pettishly answered the priest's *rorate coeli desuper* with "Rorisse þe rorie ne wrthe nan" (i. e., your *rories* and *ories* are all to no purpose). Quoted from Sandys, *Cambridge History of Eng. Lit.*, Vol. I, p. 219.

humorously as they may tinge this poetry of wine, can still not be made to yield their quota in proof of a really German art.

But it is after all not in literal phrases, in the concrete manifestations of verbal identity, that we should hunt for our proof that Latin drinking-songs of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries reflect German tavern and tramp songs of the same period. It is rather in the implications of a text, its spirit and manner, that we get wind of the art which underlies it, of the source from which it comes. Gaston Paris built up his theory of popular origins for most of the French courtly lyrics and for all of the more objective types of mediaeval French song, although in but few cases and then dimly did the actual diction and figurative verbiage of his texts correspond to popular phrases.[1] With equal fearlessness and surety of touch Winterfeld has asserted that beneath the thin crust of mediaeval Latin we may often discern German popular and native art. Notker's strength he believes to lie in a truly Swabian humor which gilds his writing as it does that of Keller and Mörike; Roswitha on the contrary he finds austere and taciturn, hiding the inner softness of her temper so that it breaks forth only now and then so unexpectedly and with such elemental force that it reminds one of Hebbel. In translating such poems as Roswitha's story of the founding of the convent at Gandersheim Winterfeld thinks the modern literary language inadequate, he argues that only provincial German diction may hope to reproduce her "gnarled" Low-Saxon manner.[2]

That we do not recognize the truth of this more readily than

[1] Cf. particularly Paris, "Les origines de la poesie lyrique en France au moyen âge" (*Journal des savants*. 1891, 1892); Jeanroy in Petit de Julleville's *Histoire de la litter. franc.*, Vol. I, pp. 362 ff., and also *Les origines* (1904)[2], pp. 10 ff.

[2] Cf. Winterfeld, *Stilfragen* (1902), pp. 11 ff.; *Herrigs Archiv.*, Vol. CXIV, pp. 29 ff.—Mediaeval Latin poetry is the meeting ground for two elements: the older epic manner of the so-called Dark Ages, the newer lyric manner of modern art. The former of these scholars have long been trying to separate from the reluctant quartz of chronicle and school-poem; but the latter can be much more readily separated, I believe, and for a simple reason. We know so much more clearly what the canons of modern art are than we do what were those of dim and ancient times. One we feel instinctively, but for the other we scarcely have intuition; we have rather only an appreciation based upon knowledge. Whatever therefore may be the success met with by investigators who have sought the early Merovingian epic in Gregory of Tours (cf. Kurth, *Histoire poétique des Mérovingiens* [1893], Gautier in Julleville's *Histoire*, Vol. I, pp. 49 ff., 168 f.), however we may adjudge such tests as those of Kögel's to regain alliterative lines from poems like the *Waltharius;* when we seek for the more modern *heimatkunst* behind and within certain mediaeval Latin lyrics of spring and wine we are surer of our reward.

we do is, I believe, the fault of ourselves; we are accustomed to regard pedantic Latin measures from the standpoint of our "classical" training and not quite simply as the awkward and sleasy house-dress which necessarily for some generations hid the quick life and the healthy body of native European thought and humor. And the mediaeval poets themselves often, generally in fact, hide their light laboriously under the bushel by being as unintelligible and artificial as they possibly can. A good illustration of this are certain lines of Nicholas of Bibera's *Carmen satiricum.*

> Sunt et ibi Scoti, qui cum fuerint bene poti,
> Sanctum Brandanum proclamant esse decanum
> In grege sanctorum, vel quod deus ipse deorum
> Brandani frater, sit et ejus Brigida mater.[1]

These verses my mind had slipped comfortably over with no thought of what they really contained, until I read Winterfeld's *Stilfragen;* even then my first feeling was that my new guide was grossly exaggerating, and it took much renewed study to convince me that he was right in insisting that we have buried here the story of how the unspeakable Irishman travels about the Continent with his national saints and his home ways: "When the Irish monk has had a bit too much, he swears St. Brandan is dean of the whole clan of saints, God himself becomes his intimate and St. Bridget his mother."[2]

[1] Vs. 1550-53; cf. Winterfeld, *Stilfragen*, p. 19, who also calls attention to how little compatible St. Columba showed himself with the situation in France; and to a joke of Walafrid Strabo (*Neue Jahrbücher*, Vol. V, p. 345).

[2] "Wirklich ein Bild im nederländischen Stile," says Winterfeld (*op. cit.*, p. 20): "die Heiligen aller Zeiten und Zungen als eine Bauerngesellschaft in rauchiger Schänke. St. Brandan, der Baas unter ihnen, schlägt just mit der Faust auf den Tisch, um seinen Worten mehr Nachdruck zu leihen. Gottvater, in der Weise eines h. Joseph gemalt, als freundlicher alter Mann mit langem weissen Barte, zwinkert mit den Augen und klopft ihm gutmütig auf den Schulter, als wollt er sagen: 'Na, Alter, renommiere nicht zu toll, wir waren auch dabei.' Und im Hintergrunde statt der Mutter Maria die heilige Brigitte mit dem strampelnden krähenden Christkind auf dem Schoss." Overdone I believe this picture to be and somewhat unwarranted in fact, but a pleasant antidote to the literality of most criticism of mediaeval Latin.

Great care should be exercised, however, not to allow loose statements regarding the native element in Latin art to sway our judgment. Taylor, for example, in his words on the transition from classical to mediaeval poetry (*Classical Heritage of the Middle Ages*, pp. 297 ff.) says "that the traits of the various peoples of Western Europe began to appear in their Latin verse and prose as through a veil." Some of what he has to offer on the score of "German feeling" and "Irish extravagance" is perhaps true: "the presence of rude German banter and rough-handed valor in the *Waltharius;* the almost burlesque fulsomeness of the inscriptions of Columbanus' letters to Boniface IV and Gregory the Great," etc. But what Taylor assumes of the characteristics or tastes of Anglo-Saxon times from Latin

We have no reason to doubt that, just as mediaeval chronicles and sermons were saturated with folklore of every sort, tales and jests, riddles and proverbs, popular custom and superstition, so mediaeval poetry of a learned stripe grew big with popular snatches of song. If it be unwise to regard the *leporis planctus:*

Flevit lepus parvulus
Clamans altis vocibus:
"Quid feci hominibus,
Quod me sequuntur canibus?"

as the Latin reproduction of a *volkslied* existent as early as the twelfth or thirteenth century, the case still shows us how at a later date *Häslein's Klagelied* became a full-fledged Latin drinking-round.[1] And the song of the roast swan, almost certainly sung when the goose was being brought to the table on St. Martin's day, assuredly had Latin and German congeners in the thirteenth century as it did in the sixteenth.[2]

We should not need the occasional German references contained in the Latin drinking-songs of the *Carmina burana* to determine

poetry is too vague to be of service; the alliteration, the love for riddles, personification of inanimate objects—these are Teutonic at least and noway specifically English. And Taylor's assertion concerning French *esprit* is visionary. For he finds "incipient French traits," balance and moderation, neatness or deftness of form, in the poems of Paulinus of Nola. In a different way, he thinks, they also appear in Gregory of Tours' *Historia*, a work in which the Latin is acquiring some of the vivacity and picturesqueness of Froissart [!]. I doubt if students of mediaeval literature will find such rule-of-thumb characterization either helpful or justified.

[1] Cf. Massmann, *Anzeiger f. Kunde d. deut. Vorzeit*, Vol. IV (1836), pp. 184 ff., who printed it from Husemann, *Perpulchri aliquot versus rythmici*, 1575; *Gaudeamus*[2], p. 186. The German song in four versions is in Erk's *Deutscher Liederhort* (1856), p. 194.

[2] Cf. the *Martinslieder* in Uhland's *Volkslieder*, Nos. 205–8 and Liliencron, *Deutsches Leben im Volkslied ums Jahr 1530;* Hoffmann, *In dulci jubilo* (1861)[2], pp. 89 f.; Burdach, *Walther von der Vogelweide* (1900), pp. 39, 285; Mayer u. Rietsch, *Die Mondsee-Wiener Liederhandschrift* (1896), pp. 511 ff. Burdach quotes a passage from the *Bonum universale de apibus* of Thomas of Cambrai (*ca.* 1263) which runs: "cantus turpissimus de beato Marplenus luxuriosis plausibus per diversas terras Galliae et Teutoniae promulgatus."

He who believes as a matter of principle that it is dangerous to assume for the twelfth and thirteenth centuries most of the types of folksong which later times possess should read R. M. Meyer's suggestive discussion on this point, *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XXIX, pp. 224–36. But just in the matter of the *Trinklied* there is often an unbroken continuity between the goliard songs and later student songs in the German universities (cf. Hubatsch, p. 99; Bärnstein, pp. 21, 136 ff.; Zarncke, *Die deutschen Universitäten im Mittelalter* [1857]; Specht, *Geschichte des Unterrichtswesens* [1885]; Kaufmann, *Geschichte der deutschen Universitäten*, Vol. I [1888]; and the bibliography and discussion in Spiegel's two pamphlets: *Die Vaganten und ihr Orden* [1892], *Gelehrtenproletariat und Gaunertum* [1902]). There is no space here to develop this point which is so important a one; viz., that many of the tavern and tramp songs of humanistic Germany may go back in their origins to the thirteenth century at least by a line of direct tradition.

the German origin of some of them.[1] Nor should we need to know that a number of them are found in other German MSS, more frequently in fact than is the case with love-songs. In reading these lyrics of the tavern and the road we are forcibly reminded of two things: first, that, fragmentary and second-rate as some of them are, they yet contain just the note which we have come to associate with German drinking-songs and with the songs of no other nation; second, that in no mediaeval Latin song which we do not strongly suspect at least to be German in authorship or coloring do we find this note. And this latter thing seems to me very important. There are French, and English and Italian love-songs written in Latin which can be told from German-Latin love-lyrics only after much study. But the same is not true of lighter Latin drinking-songs. They are either assuredly German, or very probably so in part at least. Not every Latin poem which because of its theme we carelessly label "carmen potatorium" is German—of course not. I do not know, or care, if the "drinking-songs" published by Winterfeld in the fourth volume of the *Poetae latini* are German; if such poems dealing with wine and beer as those ascribed to Marbod or Peter of Blois can be multiplied a hundredfold outside of Germany, that is again immaterial. There are as yet discovered so far as I know no Latin drinking-rounds such as those in the Benedictbeuern MS which do not point through more than one fact to German authorship.

Why this should be so, I cannot imagine. I have ever wondered why among the modern literatures the German alone has accorded its wine such high honor. There are few English songs which immortalize sherry and port, the French have spent but little elevated diction on Bordeaux or Burgundy, but the German has wreathed Rhine-wine and Moselle into thousands of his songs and in the yellow light of it spoken of what moved him most: patriotism, homesickness, bereavement, and love. Now a certain mannerism, if I be not mistaken, is peculiar to German *kommerslieder:* at times it finds expression in coarse and effective parody, often it

[1] E. g., No. 176: Bachus tollat vi *bursarum* pectora. Flavescit vinum in vitro *subrubei coloris;* No. 177: Simon in *Alsatiam* visitare patriam venit; No. 181: Gens *teutonica* nil potat melius; No. 174: *Schuch!* clamat nudus in frigore.

takes shape as tender mockery, sometimes it appears in the guise of sentimental (or maudlin) love for the maid and the scenes of home.

With these things well in mind let us revert to such songs of love and mockery and longing as we have cited in previous chapters, many of which have doubtless come down to us because of their connection with the life of the tavern and the inspiration of festivals held within it. And then let us review the lyrics which deal directly with wine and visualize the scenes these call forth.

Si quis Deciorum
Dives officio. (No. 174.)

This song has been rightly headed "So ist's Spielkomment."

In taberna quando sumus,
Non curamus quid sit humus. (No. 175.)

A sigh and a mock in one before the exiled student proceeds to the long stanzas of the sacred parody that follows.

Dum domus lapidea
Foro sita cernitur,
Et a fratris rosea
Visus dum allicitur. (No. 176.)

A stone-house on the market-place whose red wine allures.

Hac in plana tabula
Mora detur sedula,
Pares nostrae sortes
Pugnant sicut fortes. (No. 177.)

The long table cleared for drinking. And the very next song (No. 178, stanzas 2–4)[1] is the type of part-song heard at the table, first the solo and then the chorus.

And so we close our study as we began it with German popular poetry sounding in our ears and German scenes about us. However much we may have misunderstood the meaning of some of the Latin records above submitted in evidence, however little we may have been yet able to bridge over gaps which yawn here and there in our testimony, one fact shines forth perhaps more clearly

[1] Cf. Wilh. Meyer, *Ges. Abhandl.*, Vol. I, p. 327.

than before our labor was begun: Long previous to the documented poetry of troubadour, trouvère, and minnesinger there existed a body of popular vernacular love-songs which influenced and refreshed Latin lyrics of love and spring and wine, and which in turn these latter fed. And now I would leave my topic for a while, not in token of a task fulfilled but as an earnest of other work to come for which the present study has gathered the materials and built the first stepping-stones.[1]

PHILIP SCHUYLER ALLEN

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[1] An Appendix to the foregoing article will appear in the January issue of this journal.

TWO NOTES ON ADDISON

I

THE TEXT OF ADDISON

Considering the long-continued popularity of Addison's works and the clearly defined influence which they have exerted both at home and abroad, it is surprising that the texts of his writings have not been studied more carefully. According to Spence, Pope made the absurd misstatement that Addison never corrected or improved his poems after they had appeared in print. As a matter of fact, the changes in Addison's texts, both prose and verse, are very considerable and possess a genuine interest and value, for they aid us in ascertaining Addison's thought and his method of composition.

Addison died on June 17, 1719. Shortly before his death, he directed Tickell to collect and publish his writings, giving him for this new edition a dedicatory letter addressed to James Craggs. It is a safe inference that Addison had contemplated issuing his writings in their final form, and that he would have done this, had he lived. Not until October, 1721, was Tickell's edition of the "Works of the Right Honourable Joseph Addison, in Four Volumes, printed for Jacob Tonson," ready for subscribers.[1] There can be no doubt that Tickell did everything in his power to carry out the last wishes of his friend and patron. Evidently the four volumes were not hurried through the press, and in view of Tickell's almost superstitious regard for Addison, it is not probable that he would change the text in any way. We may consider, then, that the many new readings in Tickell's edition represent Addison's final revision of his own work and make this the standard text. By comparing this edition with the first editions of Addison's poems, and with the original sheets and the first collected editions of the *Tatler* and *Spectator*, we ascertain the changes Addison made in his writings.

[1] *Post Boy*, London, October 2, 1721.

The two most important poems of Addison are the *Letter from Italy* and the *Campaign*. No changes were made in the text of the *Letter*, for Tickell reprints the poem, line for line, from the first edition, showing with what care Addison had composed the "most exquisite of his poems." With the *Campaign*, the case is quite different. The journalistic side of this poem, if one may employ the phrase, has never been sufficiently recognized. The reports of the battle of Blenheim, and in fact, of the whole campaign, published in the London *Daily Courant*, August to November, 1704, are so closely followed in certain parts of Addison's poem that they could be considered the sources for his couplets. Moreover, the *Campaign*, though dated 1705, was published on December 14, 1704, the very day the Duke of Marlborough, returning from his victories, set foot in London. There seems to be more than a mere coincidence in this, for there are indications that parts of the poem at least were hastily written and sent to press with but little correction. Comparing this first edition with the text published by Tickell, we find that some eighteen passages have been revised. Many of the changes are slight ones; the following are typical of Addison's method of correction.

First edition, 1705, ll. 5, 6:

> Accept, great leader, what the Muse indites,
> That in ambitious verse records your fights.

Realizing quite justly that he was claiming altogether too much for his poem, Addison changed this, Tickell's edition, 1721, to

> Accept, great leader, what the Muse recites,
> That in ambitious verse attempts your fights.

Speaking of the crushing defeat that Marlborough inflicted on the Elector of Bavaria at the assault of the Schellenberg, Addison writes, in the first edition, ll. 217, 218:

> While to console thy doom, th' aspiring Gaul
> Shares thy destruction and adorns thy fall.

Reflecting that the Elector would scarcely be consoled by the destruction of his French allies in whom he depended, Addison

changed console thy doom" to "exalt thy doom." At times in the first edition the sense is awkwardly expressed. Ll. 267, 268 read:

> The British souls low images disclaim,
> The heat of vengeance and desire of fame
> O'erlook the foe.

To "disclaim low images" is a striking example of that vagueness of expression which too often marks Queen Anne verse. In Tickell's edition this passage reads:

> No vulgar fears can British minds control:
> Heat of revenge, and noble pride of soul
> O'erlook the foe.

Probably the majority of readers know the *Campaign* only from Macaulay's account of it in his essay on Addison, and the impression received from this essay is that Addison avoided in a rational way bombastic and fictitious accounts of Marlborough's bravery and of the multitudes he had slain. In reality, some of the couplets in the first edition are worthy of the censure Macaulay bestows on John Phillips' *Blenheim.* As an example, ll. 152–154, 1705, read:

> heaps on heaps expire,
> Whole nations, trampled into dirt and bruised,
> In one promiscuous carnage lie confused.

The anti-climax "and bruised" surely deserved a place beside the other citations from the *Campaign* to be found in the *Art of Sinking.* Tickell prints this as follows:

> heaps on heaps expire,
> Nations with nations mixed confusedly die,
> And lost in one promiscuous carnage lie.

For a final example from the *Campaign*, ll. 315–20, first edition, read:

> The rout begins, the Gallic squadrons run,
> And rush in crowds to meet the fate they shun;
> Thousands of fiery steeds with wounds transfixed
> Floating in gore, with their dead masters mixed,
> Midst heaps of broken spears and standards lie,
> And in the Danube's bloody whirl-pool die.

This is bad enough, and Addison's revision can hardly be called a success, for he merely changes the second line of the quotation to "Compelled in crowds," and in place of the final couplet substitutes:

> Midst heaps of spears and standards driven around,
> Lie in the Danube's bloody whirl-pools drowned.

It is interesting to notice, in leaving the *Campaign*, that Addison never retouched the fortune-bringing simile of the Angel who "rides in the whirlwind, and directs the storm."

It is in the *Spectators* that Addison's method of revision is best shown. There are three editions of these papers to be considered: first, the daily sheets, March 1, 1711 to December 6, 1712, and June 18, to December 20, 1714. We shall call these S 1. Secondly, the first collected edition (S 2) eight volumes, volumes one to seven, 1712–13, volume eight, 1715; and thirdly, Tickell's edition, 1721, which we shall designate S 3. So far as I can ascertain, these three texts have never been collated. In his three-volume edition of the *Spectator* (Routledge, 1883), Professor Henry Morley attemped to collate S 1 and S 2, but the work is very inaccurately done and cannot be relied upon. In his edition of the papers on *Paradise Lost*, Professor Arber collated S 1 and S 2 but not S 3. The following points have been noted in collating the three texts of eighty *Spectator* papers, not taken in regular order but from the beginning, the middle, and the end of the series.

1. Addison sought for graceful, musical expression and he shows in his corrections an unusual regard for euphony. Again and again he makes changes in the text—changes in sentence construction, transposition of words, the substitution of one synonym for another—and these revisions appear inexplicable until the sentence is read aloud. General assertions are always hazardous, yet it seems safe to say that no other prose-writer of his day equaled Addison in this endeavor to please the "nice ear." The hissing of the sibilants, the repetition of the same vowel and consonant sounds, a monotony of cadence, all these faults are avoided by a large number of textual changes, and often the revision that satis-

fies him in S 2 does not please him in S 3, which gives a different reading.

2. So far as the sense of his corrections is concerned, Addison's moderation, his constant desire to tone down or qualify his assertions is most striking. Not merely is he afraid of overstatement, but at times he restricts the most innocent assertion in a manner that is fairly amusing. Numerous examples could be given. In *Spectator*, No. 165, speaking of the French phrases used in the English reports of the battles against the French, he writes that he is so bewildered at the strange words he meets that "I do not know which side has the better of it." In S 2 and S 3 this becomes "I scarce know." He begins his first paper on *Paradise Lost*, No. 267, with the phrase "There is nothing in Nature so irksome as general discourses." Considering this to be too bold a remark, he changes it in S 2 and S 3 to "There is nothing in Nature more irksome than general discourses." In this same paper, in S 1 and S 2 he states that if Milton had opened *Paradise Lost* with the account of the battle of the angels and the creation of the world ("which he cast into the fifth, sixth, and seventh books"), he would have destroyed the unity of the poem. He softens this assertion in S 3 by adding "in my opinion." This is typical of many revisions, for he frequently adds in S 2 and S 3 such a qualifying phrase as "to every impartial judge" or inserts a "perhaps."

3. The papers on which Addison expended the greatest care were his criticisms of *Paradise Lost*. Appearing on successive Saturdays, it seems probable that they were written in no undue haste, and there was ample time to revise them before they were printed in S 1, yet comparing S 3 with S 1 we find that he has changed twenty-two passages in No. 267, twenty in No. 273, and eighteen in No. 285. It is evident that he desired these papers to stand the test of the most searching criticism.

In *Spectator*, No. 470, Addison, in his best mood, ridicules the laborious editors of the Latin poets for their insistence upon offering the reader all the various readings of the most trivial text. The satire is not inapplicable to some modern editors of our English classics, and yet it is hardly useless pedantry to observe how

Addison in his prose proved the truth of Waller's verses, and showed that

> faultless writing is the effect of care.
> Our lines reformed, and not composed in haste,
> Polished like marble, would like marble last.

II

ADDISON AND THE OLD ENGLISH BALLADS

In Johnson's *Life of Addison* occurs the following passage: "He descended now and then to lower disquisitions and by a serious display of the beauties of *Chevy Chase* exposed himself to the ridicule of Wagstaffe, who bestowed a like pompous character on Tom Thumb." This allusion to Wagstaffe and his parody of Addison's criticism is not adequately explained in any edition of Johnson's *Lives;* indeed, the latest and best one, Birkbeck Hill's, though very fully annotated, passes over these lines without comment and merely gives the full title of the pamphlet on Tom Thumb and refers the reader to Dilke's discussion of its authorship. This matter has much to interest the student of the times both for the light it throws on Addison's criticisms and for the information it yields concerning the attitude of the reading public.

Addison's papers on the ballads, *Spectator*, Nos. 70, 74, and 85, are too well known to be described at length. In the first two numbers he discusses *Chevy Chase*, giving many quotations from it; in the last paper he praises the *Babes in the Wood.* Realizing that his appreciation of these poems would seem absurd and utterly indefensible to the readers of his day, Addison endeavors to justify his admiration by finding in these ballads numerous parallels to the *Aeneid* and *Iliad.* It is needless to say that these parallels were far fetched and consequently offered a good opportunity for parody, as did his attempt to read into the ballads a high moral purpose. To sum up the matter in a phrase, Addison's taste was right but his method of defending his taste was a poor one.

In answer to these papers on the ballads, there appeared a pamphlet published by John Morphew. Consisting of twenty-four pages, it bore the title "*A Comment on the History of Tom*

Thumb, price three pence, London, 1711" and omitted any statement of the author's name. Addison's first paper on the ballads, No. 70, appeared May 21, 1711. I have been unable to ascertain the date of publication of the first edition of the *Comment*. There is no mention of it in the *London Daily Courant*, and the *Examiner*, which was published by Morphew and would naturally contain a notice of a pamphlet from his press, has no word concerning it. The *Post Man*, August 16 to 18, 1711, contains the following advertisement: "This day is published on fine Paper A Comment upon the History of Tom Thumb, tha 2d Edition Corrected. Printed for J. Morphew near Stationer's Hall, pr. 3d. N. B. There is a Sham sort printed on bad Paper, full of errors, and contains not above half the other, whereby the Sense of it is very much perverted." Less than three months after Addison's first paper on the ballads, there had appeared two editions of the parody and a third garbled one. Evidently the public was greatly interested in the matter.

Both the first and second editions of the *Comment* were published anonymously, but it was later included in the *Collected Works* of William Wagstaffe, London, 1725. In *Notes and Queries*, 3d S., Vol. I, p. 381; Vol. II, p. 396 (reprinted in *Papers of a Critic*, Vol. I, 369, London, 1875) Sir Charles Dilke advanced a theory, and supported it by some strong arguments, that these writings attributed to Wagstaffe were written in reality by Swift. Especially does the *Comment on Tom Thumb* resemble Swift's work, for it contains not only, as Dilke remarked, girds at Bentley and Blackmore quite in Swift's manner, but its reference to the Royal Society and its attack on modern criticism are thoroughly in keeping with the *Tale of a Tub*. The "Second corrected edition" of the *Comment* contains very few changes in the text and its chief emendations are that it places in italics its sarcastic allusions to Addison's statements, and introduces a slighting reference to Toland. In every way this pamphlet conforms to Swift's "Vive la bagatelle," it is certainly written in his style; but more important than the question of its authorship is its reflection of the popular opinion of the ballads as a form of doggerel, unworthy of serious consideration.

Following Addison's method the author of the *Comment* justifies his admiration for "Tom Thumb" by showing that it contains thoughts and phrases "agreeable to the Best Greek and Latin poets." The following examples are typical:

The following stanza continues the Miracle and brings the Fairy Queen and her Subjects, who gives him his name, and Makes him a Present of his Apparel

Whereas she clothed him fine and brave,
In Garments richly fair,
The which did serve him many years
In seemly sort to wear.

So Virgil of Queen Dido's Present to Ascanius

Hoc Juvenum egregium praestanti munere donat

and again

Quem candida Dido
Esse sui dederat Monumentum et pignus Amoris. (P. 10.)

Gainst whom these noble Knights did run
Sir Chion and the rest,
But still Tom Thumb with all his might,
Did bear away the best

Et primum ante omnes victorem appellat Acesten

Which made the courtiers all aghast
Obstupuere animi. (P. 17.)

The text of the *Comment* is written in Swift's vein of irony, for Addison's praise of the ballads is quoted sarcastically, word for word, and the most trivial, wretched lines in "Tom Thumb" are gravely examined for their historical and ethical import. The *Comment* is more than a parody of the ballads, an expression of undisguised contempt for them, it is a sneer at the taste of a man foolish enough to admire them—in other words, Addison was attacked as vigorously as *Chevy Chase* or the *Babes in the Wood.*

On January 8, 1712, appeared the first and second volumes of the first collected edition of the *Spectator*, containing Addison's papers on the ballads. He had revised these papers, and as we have stated, one of the features of his revision was his toning down or qualifying statements, which to the ordinary reader appear quite moderate. Certainly Addison must have read the "Tom Thumb" pamphlet, and Henry Morley notices that the revisions in the ballad papers show that he "flinched a little"

(*The Spectator*, ed. by Henry Morley, 1883, Vol. I, p. 318). This is putting the case somewhat too strongly. He had said that the numbers of *Chevy Chase* were "very sonorous;" he changes this to "sonorous;" he had spoken of the thoughts in the *Babes in the Wood* as "wonderfully natural;" in the revision he omits the adjective "wonderfully." Speaking of this same ballad he had said that its incidents "are such as Virgil himself would have touched upon, had the like story been told by that divine poet," and in the revision he had dropped the reference to Virgil and contented himself with saying that the "incidents are such as are the most proper to excite pity."[1] Considering the many eulogistic phrases he left unaltered, this is hardly to be called flinching. But he went further than this, for in his second paper on *Chevy Chase* he inserted a phrase, which, considering Addison's nature, was more than the retort courteous. Speaking of "Witherington's behaviour" in the ballad, he writes "though I am satisfied your little buffoon readers (who have seen the passage ridiculed in *Hudibras*) will not be able to take the beauty of it: for which reason I dare not so much as quote it." With this characterization of such critics as the author of the *Comment*, Addison leaves his defense of the ballads. Contemptuous ridicule had not shaken in the least his admiration for them and when he turns again from prose to verse composition we feel that the ballads have even affected his style, for we may attribute, in part, to their influence that sincere and deep feeling, that directness of expression which we find in his hymns, but which are lacking in the much-praised *Letter from Italy* and the fortune-bringing *Campaign*.

EDWARD BLISS REED

YALE COLLEGE

[1] The *Comment* uses this phrase with withering sarcasm (p. 5).

THE WELL OF LIFE AND THE TREE OF LIFE[1]

(*The Faery Queen*, Bk. I, c. xi.)

The general significance of the combat between the Redcross Knight and the Dragon has never needed discussion, because it is unmistakable. After his various minor spiritual contests, now successes and now failures, in company first with Heavenly Truth and then with Falsehood, and after the spiritual regimen of the House of Holiness, the champion of Holiness, the human soul in quest of salvation, must fight the crowning fight with the enemy of mankind, the Devil. Various commentators will express the idea in various ways, but concerning the general sense of the spiritual, as distinguished from the historical, allegory, there can be no dispute. The details, on the other hand, are not altogether so evident, and it is with the most important of these that the present paper has to do.

The combat, naturally enough, is much the longest and most doubtful in the book. At the end of a day of fighting, in which the knight has been unable to hurt his enemy seriously, the monster breathes out a "flake of fire" which so sorely scorches him that he would fain cast off his armor. He is then easily beaten to the ground.

> It fortuned (as fayre it then befell,)
> Behynd his backe, unweeting, where he stood,
> Of auncient time there was a springing well,
> From which fast trickled forth a silver flood,
> Full of great vertues, and for med'cine good.
> Whylome, before that cursed dragon got
> That happy land, and all with innocent blood
> Defyld those sacred waves, it rightly hot
> The Well of Life, ne yet his vertues had forgot.

[1] After this paper had been finished and submitted for publication the writer discovered that, as far back as 1871, in *Notes and Queries*, 4th ser., Vol. VII, p. 2, the interpretation here urged had been suggested by Thomas Keightley. Since Keightley did not argue the point, but contented himself with a two-line suggestion, and since his view has been ignored by all subsequent commentators, the paper seemed still to have enough *raison d'être* to warrant its publication.

For unto life the dead it could restore,
And guilt of sinfull crimes cleane wash away;
Those that with sicknesse were infected sore
It could recure, and aged long decay
Renew, as one were borne that very day.
Both Silo this, and Jordan, did excell,
And th' English Bath, and eke the German Spau,
Ne can Cephise, nor Hebrus match this well:
Into the same the knight back overthrowen fell.

There he lies over night. In the morning, refreshed and strengthened, he renews the combat with better success. He manages to hew off one paw and the better part of the tail of the beast. Again, however, he is overcome by the deadly fire, and again falls, this time at the foot of a tree.

There grew a goodly tree him faire beside,
Loaden with fruit and apples rosy redd,
As they in pure vermilion had beene dide,
Whereof great vertues over all were redd:
For happy life to all which thereon fedd,
And life eke everlasting did befall:
Great God it planted in that blessed stedd
With his Almighty hand, and did it call
The Tree of Life, the crime of our first fathers fall.

In all the world like was not to be fownd,
Save in that soile, where all good things did grow,
And freely sprong out of the fruitfull grownd,
As incorrupted Nature did them sow,
Till that dredd dragon all did overthrow.
Another like faire tree eke grew thereby,
Whereof who so did eat, eftsoones did know
Both good and ill: O mournfull memory!
That tree through one mans fault hath doen us all to dy.

From that first tree forth flowd, as from a well,
A trickling streame of balme, most soveraine
And dainty deare, which on the ground still fell,
And overflowed all the fertile plaine,
As it had deawed bene with timely raine:
Life and long health that gracious ointment gave,
And deadly wounds could heale, and reare againe
The sencelesse corse appointed for the grave.
Into that same he fell: which did from death him save.

Another night passes; then a second time he rises in the morning with increased vigor, which now enables him to end the enterprise. The beast makes toward him with open mouth, he thrusts his sword down into its maw, and the long fight is over.

Some commentators on the allegory of this three-day battle between the Knight of Holiness and the old Dragon have seen in it a reference to Christ's harrowing of Hell and his resurrection on the third day, and of course, among various meanings more or less definitely in the poet's mind that may very well have been one. The fact that the battle lasts three days, however, might seem to be more naturally explainable by the poet's desire to throw emphasis, narrative or allegorical or both, upon the Well of Life and the Tree of Life. Each of these marks a definite stage in the battle, which he could best indicate by the interval of night. What, then, do this well and this tree, so emphasized, stand for?

Most of those critics who deal with the allegory of the poem, including Ruskin, Henry Morley, J. E. Whitney, Max Hoffmann, and others, have nothing to say upon this point at all, nothing definite. For them the battle has meaning only as a whole. A few treat it more or less specifically. Upton points out the relation of this well and this tree to the river and tree of Rev. 22: 1, 2:

> And he shewed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb. And in the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life, which bare twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month: and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations.

As for any particular allegorical sense which the poet may have intended them to bear, however, Upton has only one hint to offer. In comment upon the line (stanza 34) "So new this new-borne knight to battell new did rise,' he remarks "New-born, i. e., being as it were regenerated by baptism in the well of life"—which leaves us uncertain whether or no he takes the well to represent definitely the sacrament of baptism. For the tree he has no explanation. Dean Kitchin is more comprehensive, but also very "general":

> The well, the trees of life, and of the knowledge of good and ill, are intended to indicate the allegorical meaning of the struggle, as between

Holiness and the Devil; and to shew that (in accordance with the Anglican views on grace) man by himself cannot prevail against evil. . . . . This "holy water" from the well of life is . . . . simply allegorical of spiritual comfort and help in the struggle.

With this somewhat vague interpretation Professor Percival (editor, like Dean Kitchin, of Book I separately) is not content. He feels, apparently, that the Well of Life and the Tree of Life must stand for definite facts or ideas, and, casting about for such, lights upon the gospel and Christ. "In the allegory," he writes, "the well stands for the doctrines and ordinances of the Gospel." As for the tree: "In the *Ayenbite of Inwyt*, 95 ff., is an elaborate allegory on the tree of life, 'that is Jesu Crist'"—and Spenser, he declares, also means Christ. Mr. W. H. Hill (a third editor of Book I separately) accepts these interpretations of Professor Percival and adds a comment inspired apparently by Upton. Of the knight issuing from the well "new-borne" he says: "an allusion is intended to the doctrine of Regeneration. The Knight cannot conquer evil in his own strength: he must be born again of water and the spirit."

Of these four commentators, then, Upton and Mr. Hill associate the Well of Life more or less closely with the sacrament of Baptism, and so does Professor Percival in a note not transcribed here; yet the two latter assert that it stands for the gospel, and even Upton does not say unmistakably that it represents Baptism; his "as it were" leaves him uncommitted. The meaning of the poet, however, is spoken in words that would seem to be decisive. After telling how the knight, rising refreshed from the well, is enabled to wound his enemy in the head, he remarks (stanza 36):

> I wote not whether the revenging steele
> Were hardned with that holy water dew,
> Wherein he fell, or sharper edge did feele,
> Or his baptized hands now greater grew,
> Or other secret vertue did ensew . . . . .

"Holy water" and "baptized" surely make the reference to the sacrament as clear as may be, and enable us even to go farther; for if by the well Spenser means Baptism, it seems most likely that by the tree he means, not Christ, but the other sacrament,

the Lord's Supper. In fact, the best commentary upon this long battle with the Dragon is to be found in the Anglican Catechism:

Question. How many sacraments hath Christ ordained in his Church?

Answer. Two only, as generally necessary to salvation, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord.

This part concerning the sacraments, to be sure, was not added to the Catechism till the Hampton Court Conference of 1604, five years after Spenser's death. It did no more, however, than express what was already contained or implied in Article 25 of the church: the idea that Baptism and the Holy Communion were "generally necessary to salvation" was the idea of Spenser's own day. In any case, that he should construct an allegory on Holiness in which these two fundamental institutions of Christianity should merely be glanced at, or ignored altogether, is surely unthinkable.

To consider their appropriateness to this particular passage of the book: Hitherto the knight has been engaged with individual sins. He has overcome Error (specifically, the sins of "private judgment"), he has succumbed to the wiles of Falsehood (specifically, Romanism), he has defeated Spiritual Joylessness, he has been enthralled to Carnal Pride, he has barely escaped Despair. To none of these conflicts could the two sacraments be especially appropriate. But now he is engaged with the spiritual enemy of mankind, the Devil (or, as Hoffmann puts it, the power of original sin): it is the conflict that sums up all the others, the conflict that concerns his final salvation. At this point, the more one considers the matter, the more inevitable it seems that his victory should come by the spiritual aid of the sacraments "generally necessary to salvation."

The conviction is strengthened when one considers the previous canto, that devoted to the House of Holiness. There we find mention of Penance, of the seven good works established by Catholic theology, and of other such institutions. That Baptism and the Lord's Supper are not mentioned or figured there would indicate that the poet must have reserved them for another place.

That there has been so much uncertainty in the interpretation of well and tree is probably due to vagueness in the allegorical

description of them. The abundant details rather cloud than declare the hidden sense: they are heaped up with too little regard for doctrine. And this is altogether characteristic of the poet, for though he could at times render the very life of an embodied idea with unmistakable vividness, he was also prone to be drawn aside by his fancy into overelaboration of merely picturesque or allusive detail. If one reads the stanzas in question, however, it will be clear that they express Baptism and the Lord's Supper at least as well as they do the gospel and Christ, and, in the end, though matters of allegorical interpretation can hardly be argued with absolute conclusiveness, the meaning here suggested seems to me to have in its favor the weight of superior probability.

R. E. Neil Dodge

The University of Wisconsin

PEARL 212 ff.

The editors print ll. 212–16 of *The Pearl* as follows (minor differences, of punctuation, etc., disregarded):

> Her ble more blaȝt þen whalleȝ bon;[1]
> As schorne golde schyr her fax þenne schon
> On schyldereȝ þat leghe vnlapped lyȝte.
> Her depe colour ȝet wonted non
> Of precious perle in porfyl pyȝte.

The translators render:

(Gollancz, London, 1891)

> whiter than whale-bone was her hue.
> Her locks shone then as bright pure gold,—
> loose on her shoulders so softly they lay,—
> though deep their colour, they needed not
> those precious pearls on her robe bedight.

(Coulton, London, 1906)

> Her hue more white than walrus-bone.
> As gold refined her tresses shone,
> That on her shoulders lay loose and light;
> Their deep colour yet needed none
> Of the precious pearls that her robe bedight.

(Mitchell, New York, 1906)

> She stood more white than whale-tooth's hue.
> Her loosened locks, that gold exceed,
> Flowed wandering, o'er her shoulders curled;
> Though dark their gold, they scarce did need
> For contrast fair her robe impearled.

(Osgood, Princeton, 1907)

Her hue was paler than ivory. Her hair glistened like bright shorn gold, as it lay loose and light upon her shoulders. Yet her color was deep, wanting not the adornment of the precious pearls in broidery all about.

Gollancz's note is: "*Her depe colour yet wonted non:* lit. 'yet her (or their) deep colour needed naught,' i. e. 'was nowise

[1] L. 178 is: 'Hyr vysage whyt as playn yuore.'

inferior to.' I render 'their,' referring to *fax*, a singular noun with a plural idea; it seems to me a distinct loss to the beauty of the passage to take the word as the fem. possessive."

Osgood's comment is: "*colour*. At 753 *colour* implies whiteness, but here a ruddy hue. This mingling of white and red is a convention; cf. *Destr. Troy* 304 f.:

> Hir chekes full choise as the chalke white,
> As the rose was the rud þat raiked hom in.

Cf. Böddeker 156. 34; Watriquet, *Dit de la Feste du Conte de Flandre* 295: 'si vermaus et si blanz;" also *ib.* 171, 186, 272, 273."

None of the renderings of the last two lines seems very satisfactory. As against Gollancz's interpretation of *fax* as plural[1] may be adduced *Gawayne* 181:

> Fayre fannand fax vymbefoldes his shulderes;

Purity 1689–91:

> Faxe fyltered, & felt flosed hym vmbe,
> Þat schad fro his schulderes to his schyre wykes
> & twenty-folde twynande hit to his tos raȝt.

Bone Florence 1545–46 (quoted by *NED.*):

> Then they lowsyd hur feyre faxe,
> That was yelowe as the waxe.

This sufficiently disposes of the renderings of Gollancz, Coulton, and Mitchell. Osgood's theory that the maiden's complexion is blended of the rose and the lily is not only at variance with the general pearliness of the poem, but is flatly contradicted by l. 212. Then, according to *NED.*, *depe* (*deep*) is not used to characterize color before 1550, and hence "her color was deep" seems to lack authority.

A word as to *wonted*. Gollancz, Coulton, and Mitchell translate by "needed," "did need;" but is there any authority for this sense so early? For the Chaucerian instances of the verb Skeat gives such meanings as "be absent," "be lacking," "fail," "lack," "be free from," etc. Osgood's "wanting not" is ambiguous;

[1] *Feax* takes a singular verb in OE; thus Ælfric, *Hom.* 2. 434. 7; *Past. Care* 139. 17; Wulfstan 148. 4.

does it mean "needing not," or "not deprived of"?[1] In either case, it is not easy to see the relevance of the clause to that which precedes, nor what is the meaning of the "Yet" with which the sentence begins.[2]

Now all these difficulties can be obviated by reading *color*, and translating as "collar." To the reading *color* there can be no objection. Not only does the word occur in that precise form (22), but there are also *fauor* (968), *flauorez* (87), *cloystor* (969); cf. *bor* (964), *flor* (29, 208, 962), *flor-* (195), *tor* (966), *corte* (701), *cortayse* (433, 469, 481), *cortez* (754), *cortaysly* (381), *cortaysye* (432, 444, 456, 457, 468, 469, 480, 481), *porchace* (744), *porchasez* (439), *porfyl* (216) etc.; the preference for *-or* is shown even by such forms as *fasor* (431), *tresor* (237, 331), *harporez* (881), *supplantorez* (440), *-cortel* (203), *yor* (761). Against these, in words of French derivation, we have only *flowred* (270), *flowrez* (208)— *-ow-* instead of *-ou-* —and *oure* (530, 551), *hourez* (555). It follows that the abbreviation over *o* need never be represented by *ur* in this text, but should rather be understood as *r*. The rimes in stanzas 36 and 81 will render this abundantly evident.

As there is no objection to reading *color* in l. 215, so it can readily be shown that "collar" is an appropriate rendering. While *coler* is the usual ME. form, *color* does occur. Thus in *The Flower and the Leaf* (145–48):

> Many a riche stoon
> Was set [up-] on the purfils, out of dout,
> Of *colors*, sleves, and traines round about,
> As gret[e] perles, round and orient, etc.

Here the collars have "purfils," and the "purfils" are set with pearls, so that it is hardly necessary to multiply proofs. One or two other quotations are confirmatory:
The Flower and the Leaf 214–15:

> About their nekkes, with gret *perles* set,
> *Colers* brode.

[1] It is only fair to say that the glossary in his edition has "lack."
[2] The glossary has "besides," "further."

The Assembly of Ladies 524–30:

> And what *purfyl* there was, and in what wyse,
> So as I can, I shal it you devyse.
> After a sort the *coller* and the vent,
> Lyk as ermyne is mad in *purfeling;*
> With grete *perles*, ful fyne and orient,
> They were couched, al after oon worching,
> With dyamonds in stede of powdering.[1]

As stanzas 17–19 are chiefly devoted to a description of the maiden's pearl-embroidered vesture, and of the pearls which form her crown and brooch, it is not surprising that, in stanza 18, the poet should proceed downward from her crown to her collar, by way of her face, her hair, and her shoulders, and thus pass, in the next stanza, to the flawless pearl—evidently symbolical in a peculiar degree—that constitutes the jewel at her breast.

ALBERT S. COOK

YALE UNIVERSITY

[1] Canon Pietro Cesola, in his *Pilgrimage to Jerusalem in the Year 1494*, transl. Newett, Manchester, 1907, says (p. 194): "Those who can afford it, and also those who cannot, dress very splendidly, and have magnificent jewels and *pearls in the trimming round their collars.*"

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE HISTORY OF LITURGICAL DRAMA AT ROUEN[1]

Although the liturgico-dramatic offices connected with the cathedral at Rouen during the Middle Ages have been an object of study for at least two centuries,[2] it appears that by no means all of the pertinent information has yet been brought forward, and that part of the accessible information is unreliable. The purpose of the present article is to contribute to the subject certain new texts from manuscripts, and to estimate the validity of certain texts already published.

I

The existence of the two dramatic offices contained in the first text that I offer has been generally known since 1893, when Monsieur A. Gasté called attention to them and printed extracts from one of them.[3] To the desire, repeatedly expressed,[4] for a complete

[1] It will be observed that in the texts published in this article the rubrics are printed in italics, the abbreviations of the manuscripts being expanded in Roman type. The liturgical text itself is printed in Roman type, with expansions in italics.

[2] See Bibliographical Note at the end of this article. To that bibliography one may add the following references bearing upon the liturgical peculiarities and the liturgical dramatic offices of Rouen: *Dissertation sur la légitimité des bréviaires de France en général, et du bréviaire de Rouen en particulier*, par M. —— (Paris, 1830); [L'Abbé Bourdin], *Des liturgies françaises en général et de la liturgie normande en particulier* (Paris, 1856); Langlois, *Mémoire sur les variations de la liturgie de Rouen* (Rouen, 1861); A. Collette, *Histoire du bréviaire de Rouen* (Rouen, 1902), pp. 81–151; L'Abbé Picard, in *Précis analytique des travaux de l'Académie de Rouen*, XLIX (1847), 373–82; *Revue du clergé français*, XXXIII (1902–3), 240–49; A. Collette et A. Bourdon, *Histoire de la Maîtrise de Rouen* (Rouen, 1892), pp. 18–27; [Dom Pommeraye]. *Histoire de l'église cathédrale de Rouen* (Rouen, 1686), pp. 620, 621; P. Aubry, *La musique et les musiciens d'église en Normandie au XIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1906), pp. 23–30; T. Bonnin, *Regestrum Visitationum Archiepiscopi Rothomagensis* (Rouen, 1852), pp. 44, 166, 167, 197, 384, 431, 517; *Le Graduel de l'église cathédrale de Rouen au XIIIe siècle*, 2 vols. (Rouen, 1907), Vol. I, pp. 13–16, 31–33, 58–62, 193–98; J. Loth, *La cathédrale de Rouen* (Rouen, 1879), pp. 569–71; L. Delisle, "Un livre de chœur normano-sicilien," *Journal des savants* (1908), pp. 42–49; *Voyages liturgiques de France . . . . par le Sieur de Moléon* (Paris, 1718), p. 305; Edmund Bishop, "Holy Week Rites of Sarum, Hereford, and Rouen Compared," *Transactions of the Society of St. Osmund*, Vol. I, Part IV, pp. 77–100.

[3] A. Gasté, *Les drames liturgiques de la cathédrale de Rouen* (Évreux, 1893), pp. 33, 34, 53–56. I may mention the fact that this indispensable study exists in three forms: (1) An article, under the title given above, in *Annales de la Faculté de Lettres de Caen*, 4me Année, No. 1, pp. 1–18; No. 2, pp. 95–131; (2) An enlarged version of the same article under the same title in *Revue catholique de Normandie*, January, 1893, pp. 349–72; March, pp. 477–500; May, pp. 593–605; (3) A reprint of (2). My references throughout are to (3), the reprint.

[4] See W. Meyer, *Fragmenta Burana* (Berlin, 1901), p. 41; E. K. Chambers, *The Mediaeval Stage* (Oxford, 1903), Vol. II, pp. 43, 48, n. 1; H. Anz, *Die lateinische Magierspiele* (Leipzig, 1905), p. 11.

text of these two dramatic offices, there has been hitherto, I believe, no response.

The manuscript under consideration bears the mark, H. 304, in the Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Médecine, Montpellier.[1] Since former descriptions of the manuscript have been incomplete, and since an indication of its exact contents is important for an understanding of the text that I present below, I offer the following information.

Montpellier MS H. 304 measures 176×256 millimeters, and contains 51 folios of substantial parchment bound in dark gray cloth. The collation may be expressed as follows:

$$a^2 a^{1+8}\ b^8\ c^{2+1+4}\ d^{4\,(4\text{ wanting})}\ e^6\ f^{10+1}\ g^{8\,(5\text{ wanting})}\ \beta^2$$

On the recto of the second fly-leaf at the beginning of the codex we read:

Joannis de Bayeux Episcopi Abrincensis ad Maurilium. Rotomagensis ecclesiae Archiepiscopum Collectio ex Sententijs $\overline{ss}$ Patrum et consuetudinibus diuersarum ecclesiarum eorum quae ad divini cultus officia pertinent. Concilium habitum Rotomagi anno MLXXIV. Capitula Concilij apud Wintoniam celebrati. Concilium habitum apud Illebonam anno MLXXX, cuius capitula et canones inseruntur. Alitgarii Liber de octo Vitijs et eorum Remedijs. Eiusdem de Virtutibus et actuali Vita; desunt II extrema capita.

CODEX MS.
BIBLIOTHECAE BUHERIANAE
D. 71.
MDCCXXI.

The codex contains the following articles.

1. Fols. 1^r–1^v: Praeceptum de eo quod observandum est si ceciderit corpus vel sanguis Domini.
2. Fols. 2^r–22^v: Johannis de Bayeux, Abrincensis tunc episcopi, de officio ecclesiastico.[2]

[1] See *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques des Départements*, Tome I (Paris, 1849), p. 408. From this description I adopt the titles of the articles contained in the manuscript. See also Migne's *Nouvelle encyclopédie théologique*, Vol. XL (1853), col. 592. I wish to express my gratitude to Monsieur Henri Omont, through whose kindness this manuscript was deposited for my study in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris.

[2] This version of the *Liber de Officiis Ecclesiasticis* of Jean d'Avranches is somewhat more complete, at the end and elsewhere, than is the edition of 1679, *Joannis Abrincensis Episcopi deinde Rotomagensis Archiepiscopi Liber De Officiis Ecclesiasticis. Notis D. Joannis Prevotii . . . . illustratus.* Rotomagi, 1679. One passage not found in this edition but found in Montpellier MS H. 304 may be seen below, p. 4, n. 5. The MS, or MSS, used in the edition of 1679 are thus referred to on the title-page: *Primum ex codice MS. coenobii Salicosani in lucem editus, nunc ex MS. codice bibliothecae Bigotianae auctus et emendatus.* The

3. Fols. 23r–24r: Concilium Rothomagense (anno 1074, praeside eodem Johanne).
4. Fols. 24r–24v: Concilii Wintonensis canones XVI.
5. Fols. 24v–27r: Concilium Illebonense (anno 1080, eodem Joanne praeside).
6. Fols. 28r–42v (27v is blank): Fragmentum operis de ratione divini officii (incerti auctoris).
7. Fols. 43r–43v: Gregorii papae epistola ad Secundinum monachum.
8. Fols. 44r–44v: Sermo ad monachos (incerti auctoris).
9. Fols. 45r–51v: Halitgarii episcopi Cameracensis de vitiis et virtutibus libri II.

The part of the codex with which we are especially concerned is No. 6: "Fragmentum operis de ratione divini officii (incerti auctoris)." The Fragment begins at the very top of folio 28r as follows:

. . . . cantant*ur*, uel q*uo* sacrificium celebratur, duo simul n*isi* aliq*uis* inter posit*us* fuerit, n*on* sedeant. Igit*ur* sacra auctoritate p*ro*hibitum est ne aliq*uis* clericus post solis occasum p*er* plateas *uel* uias absq*ue* necessitate *uel* testimonio bonor*um* uiror*um* p*er*gat, nulliusq*ue* domum absq*ue* licentia decani *uel* fideli testimonio intret. Qui aut*em* istud p*re*ceptum uiolauerit, trib*us* dieb*us* ab inicio matitunalis officii usq*ue* ad finem completorii ita in eccles*ia* maneat, ut inde n*isi* causa prandendi *uel* purgandi exeat.

The Fragment ends at the very bottom of folio 42v, in the midst of the *Officium Stellae*, as may be seen below. The several articles in the codex are written in several different hands, all of the twelfth century. The Fragment was all written by one scribe, in a hand seen nowhere else in the codex.[1]

Since the Fragment is found in a codex containing several documents explicitly connected with Normandy and with Rouen, and since Rouen was eminent during the later Middle Ages for its liturgical dramas, one is inclined to presume, provisionally, that the Fragment, with its dramatic offices, is also connected with Normandy, if not with Rouen itself. M. Gasté, however, the only

editor of this edition was Le Brun Desmarettes, who under the pseudonym, DeMoléon, published *Voyages liturgiques de France* (Paris, 1718). See *Revue du chant grégorien*, XI (1902–3), p. 191, n. 1. The edition of 1679 is reprinted by Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, CXLVII, cols. 15–116. Since Migne reproduces accurately all the points in which I wish to refer to this work, I shall make my references to the more accessible reprint. U. Chevalier is preparing a new edition of the *Liber de Officiis Ecclesiasticis*. See *Rev. du chant grég., loc. cit.*, and A. Collette, *Histoire du bréviaire de Rouen* (Rouen, 1902), p. 65, n. 3.

[1] This manuscript contains no music.

writer who, so far as I know, has discussed this special point, believes that this document and the dramatic offices are "d'un auteur d'une autre province."[1] For this opinion Gasté seems to have two reasons. In the first place he quotes, probably from the Fragment,[2] the following passage, which gives preliminary directions concerning the *Officium Pastorum:*

Interim praeparentur VII juvenes, amictis et albis et tunicis induti, baculos in manibus ferentes, in similitudine pastorum.

Regarding this excerpt Gasté says, "Ce simple détail, mais caractéristique, me ferait croire que le traité incomplet *de Ratione divini officii*, qui contient les offices des Pasteurs et de l'Étoile, et qui se trouve, dans le MS. de Montpellier, à la suite du *Liber de Officiis Ecclesiasticis* de Jean d'Avranches et d'autres opuscules d'origine normande, est d'un auteur d'une autre province."[3] The writer's reasoning seems to be that since in connection with the *Officium Pastorum* contained in well-known Rouen *Ordinaria*[4] there is no rubric similar to that quoted above from the Fragment, this latter document cannot be associated with Rouen.

This argument loses all its force, I believe, before the following considerations:

1. The version of the *Liber de Officiis Ecclesiasticis* of Jean d'Avranches contained in the Montpellier codex offers the precise rubric pointed out by Gasté as peculiar to the Fragment.

Interim preparentur vii iuuenes, amictis et albis et tunicis induti, baculos in manibus ferentes, in similitudine pastorum.[5]

[1] Gasté, p. 34.

[2] Gasté does not tell us (pp. 33, 34) from what part of the Montpellier MS he quotes, and evidently he was not aware of the fact that this precise passage occurs twice in this MS, in the Fragment (fol. 32r) and in the treatise of Jean d'Avranches (fol. 9r).

[3] Gasté, p. 34.

[4] The *Officium Pastorum* from Rouen MS Y. 110 (Ordinarium Rothomagense) is printed (with some variants from Rouen MS Y. 108) by Gasté, pp. 25–32. The text from Bibl. Nat. MS lat. 1213 (Ordinarium Rothomagense) is printed below.

[5] Montpellier MS H. 304, fol. 9r. The MS or MSS used by Le Prévost in his edition of Jean d'Avranches did not contain this detail (see Migne, CXLVII, 41); hence Chambers (*Mediaeval Stage*, II, 43–44) inferred, from "the absence of any reference to the *Officium Pastorum* by John of Avranches," that this observance was not known at Rouen until later —later, that is, than about 1070. One may observe that the "vii iuuenes" in the rubric quoted from the Montpellier MS has a parallel in the following rubic from the *Officium Pastorum* in the Rouen Gradual (Bibl. Nat. MS 905, fol. 12r):

"Hoc audientes vii pueri stantes in alto loco dicant . . . ."

To be sure, the "vii pueri" are the angels who sing the *Gloria in excelsis*, and are not "pastores," as are the "vii iuuenes" of the Montpellier MS. Since no other Rouen *Officium*

There can be no doubt that Jean d'Avranches wrote for Rouen, or certainly, at least, for the *provincia* of Rouen.[1] The "simple détail, mais caractéristique" is, then, a mark of relationship between Rouen and the Fragment, rather than a point of divergence between them.

2. The *Officium Pastorum* of the Fragment as a whole agrees strikingly with the similar texts incontestably connected with Rouen.[2]

Gasté's other reason for refusing to associate the Fragment with Rouen is that the *Officium Stellae* in the Fragment is conspicuously different from the similar *officia* known to have been performed at Rouen.[3] This reason has force, and, in fact, the differences referred to are so important that one could hardly admit a connection with Rouen without strong positive evidence. Such evidence can, I think, be found.

In the part of the Fragment that is placed under the rubric, *De Festiuitatibus Sanctorum*,[4] we read,

He sunt autem festiuitates que more dominicali celebrantur, excepto quod Matutinum non dicatur: Siluestri, Sebastiani, Vincentii, Agnetis, Cecilie, Agathe, Cathedre[5] Sancti Petri, Geruasii, Translationis Sancti Martini, *Wandregisili*, *Germani*, Inuentionis Sancti Stephani, Remigii, Georgii, Leodegarii, *Romani*, *Audoeni*, Lucie uirginis, et alie que placuerint; et omnium sanctorum pontificum qui huic ecclesie prefuerunt.[6]

Pastorum has a rubric like this one from Bibl. Nat. MS lat. 904, appointing "vii pueri" to sing the *Gloria in excelsis*, one might apply Gasté's reasoning and argue from "ce simple détail" that MS 904 does not come from Rouen. But it incontestably does.

[1] See below, p. 6, n. 2. Mr. Edmund Bishop characterizes the *De Officiis Ecclesiasticis* of John of Avranches as "Rouen ceremonial of the eleventh century" (*Transactions of the Society of St. Osmund*, Vol. I, Part IV, p. 99).

[2] The similar Rouen texts are found in Gasté, pp. 25–32, from Rouen MS Y. 110, fol. 22r–23r; in E. de Coussemaker, *Drames liturgiques au moyen âge* (Rennes, 1860), pp. 235–41, from Bibl. Nat. MS lat. 904, fol. 11v–12v; in the text below from Bibl. Nat. MS lat. 1213, pp. 17, 18.

[3] I refer to Rouen MS Y. 110, fol. 38v–39r, printed by Gasté, pp. 49–52; Bibl. Nat. MS lat. 904, fol. 23v–30r, printed by Coussemaker, pp. 242–49; and Bibl. Nat. MS lat. 1213, pp. 34, 35, printed below. The *Officium Stellae* in the Montpellier Fragment differs not only from these three Rouen texts, but also from all the other *Officia Stellae* with which I am acquainted.

[4] Montpellier MS H. 304, fol. 40r.

[5] MS, cathedra.

[6] *Id.*, fol. 41r. The same passage is found also in the *Liber de Officiis Ecclesiasticis* of Jean d'Avranches. See Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, CXLVII, 61.

This enumeration of saints at once attaches the Fragment indisputably to Rouen.[1] It has been suggested that the placing of the great Rouen saints, Romanus and Audoenus, in a list of saints of a lower order at Rouen may indicate that the writer was composing his treatise not for Rouen alone, but for the *provincia* of Rouen.[2] In any case, the document cannot be disassociated from the *use* of Rouen, and an "auteur d'une autre province" is, I think, out of the question.

TEXT FROM FRAGMENTUM OPERIS DE RATIONE DIVINI OFFICII[3]

[fol. 41r] *De Die Dominico*

Dies dominicus ita celebratur. In Sabbato, psalmis diei cum antiphonis suis dictis, et *capitulo dicto*, responsorium *a* duobus *clericis absque cappis cantetur*, quod *hymnus sequatur*; et *ad Magnificat altare incensetur*. In *Matutinis Inuitatorium a* duobus *clericis absque* cappis *cantetur*. Nouem *lectiones* et nouem *responsoria dicantur*. *Te Deum laudamus, excepto Aduentu* et *Quadragesima, dicatur*. *Hymnus in Nocturnis* et *Matutinis Laudibus dicatur*. In *Matutinis Laudibus*, exceptis *prefatis temporibus, una tantum* antiphona *cantetur*. *Post Primam processio fiat, ut predictum est*. *Officium cum* duobus *cantoribus celebretur*. *Ministri* ita *induantur*: *diaconus dalmatica, subdiaconus tunica*, duo *in albis, qui candelabra*, et *unus qui thuribulum deferat*. *Gradale* duo *iuuenes in albis canant*, et duo *cum cappis Alleluia*.[4]

[1] For the *sanctorale* of Rouen see the calendars in Rouen MS Y. 110, fols. 1r–6v; Bibl. Nat. MSS lats. 1266 A., fols. 133–38, and 1213, fols. C–G; A. Collette, *Histoire du bréviaire de Rouen* (Rouen, 1902), pp. 153–94; H. Loriquet, J. Pothier, and A. Collette, *Le graduel de l'église cathédrale de Rouen au xiii^e siècle* (Rouen, 1907), Vol. I, pp. 6–11. 123–40; Vol. II, Introduction. For the identification of the saints in the list quoted above see *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina antiquae et mediae aetatis, ediderunt Socii Bollandiani* (Bruxellis, 1898–99); H. Grotefend, *Zeitrechnung des Deutschen Mittelalters und der Neuzeit*, Bd. II, Abtheilung II, pp. 55 ff. See also Gams, *Series Episcoporum Ecclesiae Catholicae* (Ratisbonae, 1873), pp. 613–15. On the same list of saints in the treatise of Jean d'Avranches see Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, CXLVII, col. 116. See also L. Delisle, *Journal des savants* (1908), p. 44.

[2] See Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, CXLVII, col. 116, where the comment on the precisely similar list of saints in the treatise of Jean d'Avranches applies equally well to the list in the Fragment. The list of saints in the treatise of Jean d'Avranches of course attaches that work also to the *provincia* of Rouen, an attachment that is inevitable from Jean's eminent association with that *provincia*. A discussion of the fact that the author of the Fragment seems to have borrowed many considerable passages from the treatise of Jean d'Avranches is no part of my present study. A discussion of these relations will probably form part of Chevalier's forthcoming edition of the *Liber de Officiis Ecclesiasticis*.

[3] Montpellier MS H. 304, fol. 41r–41v.

[4] This paragraph, which has, obviously, no essential connection with the dramatic offices, I present merely in order to make clear the exact position of the dramatic offices in the Fragment, and to show that in this paragraph (as in many others) the Fragment agrees exactly with the *Liber de Officiis Ecclesiasticis* of Jean d'Avranches (see Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, CXLVII, 61, 62).

Quia[1] *ecclesiastica officia diuersi diuerse celebrant, quedam que communi ordine omisimus inserere, hoc in loco congruum nobis uidetur annotare.*[2]

[OFFICIUM PASTORUM]

In Natiuitate Domini, finito Te Deum laudamus, *pueri in uno loco ecclesie baculis se sustentantes in similitudine Pastorum consistant. Unus autem puer in excelso, amictu* et *alba indutus, in similitudine Angeli Natiuitatem Domini annuntiantis, hunc uersum dicens:*

Nolite timere, ecce enim euangelizo uobis gaudium magnum, quod erit omni populo, quia natus est uobis hodie saluator mundi in ciuitate Dauid, et hoc uobis signum: Inuenietis infantem pannis inuolutum *et* positum in presepio.

Sint item plures pueri dextra et *sinistra parte similiter induti, qui, finita prefata* antiphona, *incipiant cantando:* Gloria in excelsis Deo, *et* in terra pax hominibus bone uoluntatis, alleluia, alleluia.

Hoc iterum finito, Pastores, subsequentem antiphonam *cantantes, ad locum in quo paratum fuit Presepe accedant:* Transeamus usque Bethleem *et* uideamus hoc verbum quod factum est quod fecit Dominus *et* ostendit nobis.

Quem dum intrauerint, duo *clerici qui* [fol. 41v] *ad presepe fuerint incipiant cantare:* Quem queritis in presepe, pastores, dicite?

Pastores respondebunt: Saluatorem Χριστum Dominum infantem, pannis inuolutum, secundum sermonem angelicum.

Ad Presepe stantes iterum dicant: Adest hic paruulus cum Maria matre sua, de quo dudum uaticinando Ysaias dixerat propheta: Ecce uirgo concipiet *et* pariet filium *et* nomen eius Emmanuel dicetur.

Pastores: Natus est nobis hodie saluator qui est Χριστus Dominus in ciuitate Dauid.

Te Deum laudamus.

Quo finito, idem Pastores incipiant Introitum: Dominus dixit ad me, *et regant chorum ad omnem Missam. Finita Missa, incipiat*

[1] At this point in his treatise Jean d'Avranches proceeds to symbolistic generalizations upon what has preceded. It is in the comparative absence of symbolism that the Fragment differs most essentially from the treatise of Jean d'Avranches. Since the Fragment agrees with the *Liber* of Jean not only in many details but also in general scope, and since at the point where the dramatic offices are added in the Fragment Jean is practically at the end of his treatise, I infer that very little is lost at the end of the Fragment—probably only the end of the *Officium Stellae*, and, since such is mentioned in the body of the Fragment (fol. 37v), an *Officium Sepulchri*.

[2] The *Officium Pastorum*, *Officium Stellae*, and *Officium Sepulchri* are mentioned in the body of the Fragment in connection with Christmas, Epiphany, and Easter respectively as follows: ". . . . Te Deum laudamus alta uoce incipiat. Interim preparentur vii iuuenes amictis et albis et tunicis induti, baculos in manibus ferentes in similitudine pastorum, qui, finito *Presepis Officio*, in prima Missa usque ad finem Matutinorum regent chorum" (Montpellier MS H. 304, fol. 32r); ". . . . Te Deum laudamus incipiat. Deinde *Stelle Officium* sequatur" (*id.*, fol. 33r); ". . . . Post tercium responsorium *Officium Sepulchri* celebretur" (*id.*, fol. 37v).

Presul uersum: Benedict*us* q*ui* uenit in nomine D*omini*. *Deinde*, Deus in adiutorium, *cum* Glori*a* Patri, *et* Alleluia. *Postea incipiat cantor* antiphonam: Quem uidistis, *usque*, Quis apparuit, et *Pastores dicant:* Natum uidimus, *usque in finem*. *Postea incipiant Pastores:* Dominus regnauit, et *ad finem regendo chorum ipsi Matutinas perducant. Finita collecta Matutinarum, cantetur* antiphona: Ecce completa sunt omnia, *cum subsequenti collecta*: Deus qui salutis eterne.

[OFFICIUM STELLAE]

Officium Stelle ita celebretur. Ubi Stella apparebit, dicat Rex stans post *altare maius:* Stella fulgore nimio rutilat.

Alter, aliunde ueniens ex dextera parte, dicat: Que regem regum natum monstrat.

Tercius a sinistra ueniens dicat: Quem uenturum olim prophetia signauerat.

Regi a dextera uenienti dicat Rex medius: Pax tibi, frater.

Cui respondeat idem cum alio a sinistra ueniente: Pax quoque tibi, *sese osculando. Quo finito, chorus cantet* antiphonam: Hec primum orientales fines collustrans illarum colonis partium magne rei prebuit signum hec illos tres magos insignes prudentie capaces ad adorandum regem natum perduxit dicentes:

Et interim Reges, alter alteri ostendendo Stellam baculis innuentes erectis dicat medius: Ecce stella!

Alter in dextera dicat: Et ecce stella.

Tercius in sinistra dicat: Et ecce urrit stella!

Quo finito, dicant Reges: Eamus *ergo et* inquiramus eum, offerentes ei munera, aurum,[1] thus, *et* myrram.

Herodi in throno suo residenti dicat Internuntius: Salue, rex Iudeorum.

Huic Rex econtra: Salue[t] te gratia mea.

Item Internuntius: Assunt nobis, Domine Rex, uiri ignoti ab oriente uenientes nouiter natum quendam regem queritantes.

Rex econtra:

Anteuenire iube quo possim singula scire,
Qui sint, cur ueniant, quo nos rumore requirant.

Item Internuntius: Quod mandas citius, Rex, milite perficietur.

Quo peracto, Internuntius rediens ad Magos dicat: Que sit causa uie? Qui uos, uel unde uenitis, dicite.

Cui Magi: [fol. 42r]

Rex est causa uie; reges sumus ex Arabitis, huc uenientes;
Querimus hic regem regnantibus imperitantem,
Quem natum mundo lactat Iudaica uirgo.

Internuntius Herodi: Reges sunt, ut dicunt, ex Arabitis, regem regum regnantibus imperitantem queritantes.

[1] MS, durum.

Rex Internuntio: Ad nos uocentur, ut eorum a nobis sermones audiantur.

Internuntius Magis: Regia uos mandata uocant; non segniter ite.

Internuntius precedens reges Herodi nuntiat, baculo innuendo:

En magi ueniunt,
et regem regum natum stella duce requirunt.
Portant insonti sua munera cuncta regenti.

Quo finito, medius Rex Herodi dicat:

Salue, rex populi fortis, dominator *et* orbis,
Quid uis edissere nobis?

Quem osculetur Herodes, faciendo eum sedere in dextera parte sui. Alter in dextera Herodi dicat: Ase ai ase elo allo abadac crazai nubera satai loamedech amos ebraisim loasetiedet inbedo addoro otiso bedoranso i et o iomo bello o illa *et* cum marmoysen aharon *et* cum cizarene rauidete qui adonay moy.

Hunc osculando iubeat Herodes sedere iuxta priorem. Tertius in sinistra Herodi dicat: O some tholica lama ha osome tholica lama ma chenapi ha thomena.

De quo *Herodes faciat ut de* prioribus, *quibus Herodes dicat:* Regem quem queritis natum esse quo signo didicistis?

Magi econtra: Illum natum esse didicimus in oriente stella monstrante.

Hic ostendant Magi stellam baculis, quibus Rex: Si illum regnare creditis, dicite nobis.

Item Magi: Illum regnare fatentes cum misticis muneribus de terra longinqua adorare uenimus, trinum Deum uenerantes tribus cum muneribus.

Primus Rex erigens se a sede genuflexo ante Herodem dicat: Auro regem.

Secundus similiter dicat: Thure sacerdotem.

Tercius similiter dicat: Myrra mortalem.

Herodes Epistolariis: Huc, simiste mei, disertos pagina scribas prophetica ad me uocate.

Quo finito, Epistolarii uenientes ad scribas dicant: Vos legis periti a rege uocati, cum prophetarum libris properando uenite.

Scribe cum Epistolariis uenientes dicant Herodi: Dissere, Rex, quid uis, assumus ecce tibi.

Quibus Rex: O uos scribe, interrogati dicite si quid de hoc puero scriptum uideretis in libro.

Huic Scribe: Vidimus, Domine, in prophetarum lineis nasci Xpistum in Bethleem, ciuitate Dauid, propheta sic uaticinante.

Quo finito chorus dicat: Betleem, non es minima,
usque *in finem*.[1] Quo *audito, Herodes prospiciens in libro prophetie*

[1] In the MS a black line is drawn through the words, "usque in finem," perhaps by a later hand.

iratus proiciat. Deinde dicat Magis: Ite, *et* de puero diligenter inuestigate, *et* inuento, redeuntes *mihi* renuntiate ut *et* ego [fol. 42^{v}] ueniens adorem eum.

Qui redeuntes ab Herode insinuando sibi inter se preuisam stellam dicant: Ecce stella in oriente preuisa iterum precedit nos lucida.

Qui gradientes uersus presepe interrogent Pastores obuiam factos: Pastores, dicite quidnam uidistis *et* annunciate Xρisti natiuitatem.

Quibus Pastores respondeant: Infantem uidimus pannis inuolutum *et* choros angelorum laudantes saluatorem.

Quo audito Magi inde transeuntes cantent:

Quem non preualent propria magnitudine
Celi terre atque maria anphisepere,
De uirgineo natus utero ponitur in presepio.
Sermo cecinit quem uatidicus stant simul bos *et* asinus.
Sed oritur stella lucida prebitura domino obsequia.
Quem Balaam ex Iudaica oriturum dixerat prosapia.
Hec nostrorum oculos fulguranti lumine perstrinxit prouidos.
Atque ipsos preuia ducens ad cunabula perduxit uilia.

His peruenientibus ad Presepe dicant Obstetrices:

Qui sunt hii qui, stella duce, nos adeuntes inaudita ferunt?

Magi econtra: Nos sumus, quos cernitis, reges Tharsis *et* Arabum *et* Saba, dona ferentes Xρisto regi nato Domino, quem, stella deducente, adorare uenimus.

Item Obstetrices aperiendo Presepe dicant: Ecce puer adest quem queritis. Iam properate, adorate, quia ipse est redemptio mundi.

Quo uiso, primus Magus aurum offerendo in terram prostratus dicat: Salue, Rex, seculorum, cuius ad imperium uniuersa pauescunt, suscipe nunc aurum, regis signum.

Secundus thus offerendo subinfera[*t*]: Domine, Rex eterne glorie suscipere dignare thus sicut Deus uerus.

Tercius mirram offerendo dicat:

Puer iacens in presepe,
Tamen imperans ubique,
Suscipe mirram signum sepulture.

His adorantibus puer quasi Angelus desuper stans cantet: Impleta sunt omnia que prophetice dicta sunt; ite, uiam remeantes aliam, nec delatores tanti reges puniendi eritis.

Quo expleto, Magi aliunde redeuntes cantent: O magnum misterium, usque *in finem*. *Illis redeuntibus Internuntius dicat Herodi:* Delusus es, Domine, magi uiam redierunt aliam.

Qua peracta, Filius Herodis ad patrem: Salue, pater inclite, salue, rex egregie, qui ubique imperans sceptra tenens regia.

Cui Herodes: Fili amantissime, digne laudis munere, laudis pompam

regie tuo gerens nomine, rex est nat*us* fortior nob*is, et* potentior uereor ne nos exturb*et* nostri[1] regni solio.

Item Filius patri:

Contra natum puerum, *contra* illum regulum,
Iube, pater, maximum imminere premium.

Hac peracta, Duces tenentes nudatos gladios dicant Herodi: Decerne, Domine, uindicari iram tuam, iube occidi pueros, forte inter occisos occidetur *et* puer.

Herodes acceptum gladium librans hac et illac reddat hac quo sumpsit . . . .[2]

II

In previous seaches among the liturgical documents at Rouen for liturgico-dramatic texts, one manuscript of importance for our subject seems to have been entirely overlooked. I refer to MS 222 (*olim*, 551) in the Bibliothèque de la Ville at Rouen, of which we have the following official description:

Processionale ad usum S. Audoeni Rothomagensis. XIII^e^ siècle. Parchemin. 92 feuillet. 172 sur 110 millim. Rel. mod. (Saint-Ouen de Rouen.—Ancien n°. A. 345).[3]

The assignment of the manuscript to the use of the monastic church of St. Ouen at Rouen may rest upon the inscription, in a cursive hand of the seventeenth or eighteenth century, at the top of the first folio, "Ex lib. S. Audoeni Rotg. Congreg. S. Mauri." I can find no other authority for this assignment, which, in any case, I believe to be wrong. The frequent occurrence of the word, *archiepiscopus*, throughout the rubrics[4] seems to me clearly to indicate that the manuscript was written for use in the Cathedral of Rouen, with the usages of which, both processional and dramatic, it agrees throughout.

Of dramatic offices the manuscript contains only the *Officium Stellae* (fragmentary) and the *Officium Peregrinorum*.[5] Since the manuscript has suffered considerable laceration and loss of

[1] MS, nr̄is.

[2] Here ends the page and the Fragment.

[3] *Catalogue général des manuscripts des bibliothèques de France*, Tome I (Paris, 1866), p. 44.

[4] Cf. fols. 8r, 15v, 18v, 21r, 27v, 40v, 41v. I find nothing at all in the rubrics to suggest monastic usage.

[5] These two dramatic offices are provided with music, in square notation on four red lines.

leaves,[1] one is tempted to suppose that it may once have contained others of the dramatic offices characteristic of Rouen;[2] but for this I can offer no positive evidence.

[OFFICIUM STELLAE][3]

[fol. 4r] . . . . [*pue*]*rum, ita dicentes:* Salue, Princeps seculorum.

Tunc primus accipiens aurum a ministro suo offerat et *dicat:* Su[s]cipe, Rex, aurum.

Secundus offerens thus ita dicat: Tolle thus, tu uere Deus.

Tercius offerat mirram, et *dicat:* Mirram, signum sepulture.

Orantibus Magis et *quasi sopitis*[4] *quidam puer, alba* et *amictu indutus quasi angelus, ante altare illis dicat hanc antiphonam:* Impleta sunt omnia que prophetice dicta sunt. Ite, uiam redeuntes aliam, ne delatores tanti regis puniendi eritis.

Finita antiphona, cantor incipiat hoc responsorium, et *intret processio chorum*, et *fiat oblatio a clero* et *populo:* Tria sunt munera preciosa que obtulerunt Magi Domino in die ista, et habent in se diuina misteria, in aurum ut [fol. 4v] ostendatur Regis potencia, in thure sacerdotem magnum considera, et in mirra dominicam sepulturam. *Versus:* Salutis nostre auctorem Magi uenerati sunt in cunabulis, et de thesauris suis misticas ei munerum species obtulerunt. In aurum.

Sequatur Missa, ad quam tres Reges regant chorum, qui cantent Kyrie fons, Alle*luia*, *Versum:* Vidimus, Sanctus, et Agnus festiue.[5]

[OFFICIUM PEREGRINORUM][6]

[fol. 43r] *Feria* secunda[7] *in Matutinis*, processio *ut in die Pasche. In Vesperis similiter, excepto quod duo tantum de maiori sede regant chorum*, et *duo similiter de maiori sede cantent* Alle*luia*, Redemptionem. *Ad Vesperas post* tres *psalmos, finita antiphona, duo de secunda sede cantent hoc responsorium:* Hec dies. *Versus:* Dicant nunc Israhel, quoniam bonus, quoniam in seculum | [fol. 43v] misericordia eius. *Duo regentes chorum:* Alleluya. *Versus:* Nonne cor nostrum ardens erat in nobis, de Ihesu dum loqueretur nobis in uia? *Versus:* Resurrexit *Dominus. Antiphona:* Et coegerunt illum dicentes, mane nobiscum quia asuesperascit, alleluya. *Psalmus:* Magnificat.

[1] The loss of leaves in the extant gatherings will appear in the following collation: a2+1 (3 wanting) b6 c16 (7, 10, 14, 15, 16 wanting) d8 e4 f8 g6 h4 i10 j2 k12 l14.

[2] See Bibliographical Note at the end of this article.

[3] Rouen, Bibliothèque de la Ville, MS 222 (*olim*, A. 551), fols. 4r–4v. Fol. 3, which certainly contained the first part of this dramatic office, is torn out.

[4] Between *quasi* and *sopitis* the MS has a blank space sufficient for receiving such a word as *sompno* (see the other texts of the Rouen *Officium Stellae*), no sign of which appears. In the blank space a hand of a century later has inserted the word *in*.

[5] The rubric, *Dominica infra Octauam*, follows immediately.

[6] Rouen, Bibliothèque de la Ville, MS 222 (*olim*, A. 551), fols. 43r–45r.

[7] Easter Monday.

Post Benedicamus fiat Processio ad Fontes, ut in die Pasche, et processione *stante in medio nauis ecclesie* et *cantante psalmum*: In exitu, *circa finem psalmi duo clerici de* secunda *sede induti tunicis* et *desuper capis in transuersum portantes baculos* et *peras in similitudinem Peregrinorum intrent ecclesiam per dextram portam occidentalem* et *lento pede uenientes usque ad* processionem. *Cum finitus fuerit psalmus, subsistentes in capite* processionis *incipiant cantare hymnum:* Ihesu, nostra redemptio, et *cum cantauerint usque ad locum illum*, Nos tuo uultu sa[ties], *tunc quidam sacerdos indutus alba* et *amictu, nudus pedes crucem ferens in manibus intret ecclesiam per sinistram portam occidentalem* et *ueniens usque ad eos uultu demisso subito stet inter illos et dicat:* [fol. 44r].

Qui sunt hii sermones quos confertis ad inuicem ambulantes, et estis tristes.

Peregrini quasi admirantes et *eum respicientes dicant:* Tu solus peregrinus es in Iherusalem, et non cognouisti que facta sunt in illa hiis diebus?

Sacerdos interroget: Que?

Peregrini respondeant: De Ihesu Nazareno, qui fuit uir propheta, potens in opere et sermone coram Deo et omni populo.

Sacerdos utrimque respiciens dicat: O stulti et tardi[1] corde ad credendum in omnibus que locuti sunt prophete! Nonne sic oportuit pati Xpistum et ita intrare in gloriam [fol. 44v] suam?

Quibus dictis, statim recedat sacerdos fingens se longius ire, et *Peregrini festinanter prosequentes eum detineant quasi ad hospicium inuitantes* et *trahentes baculum ostendentes Castellum*, et *dicentes:* Mane nobiscum quoniam aduesperascit, *et* inclinata est iam dies. Sol uergens ad occasum suadet ut nostrum uelis hospicium, placent enim sermones tui quos refers de resurrectione magistri nostri.

Et ita cantantes ducant eum usque ad tabernaculum in medio nauis ecclesie in similitudinem Castelli Emaus preparatum. Quo cum ascenderint et *ad mensam ibi paratam sederint* et *Dominus inter eos sedens panem eis fregerit, in fractione panis agnitus ab illis subito recedens ab oculis eorum euanescat. Illi autem quasi stupefacti surgentes cantent uersus processionales*: Alleluia, *cum Versu*: Nonne cor nostrum. *Quo reiterato uertant se uersus pulpitum et cantent hunc uersum sequenter:* Dic nobis, Maria, quid uidisti in uia?

Tunc quidam de maiori sede indutus dalmatica et *amictu* et *uinctus in modum mulieris caput circumligatus respondeat*: Angelicos testes, suda [fol. 45r] rium et uestes.

Tun[c] ostendat et explicet unum syndonem ex una parte loco suadarii, et *alium ex altera parte loco uestium, deinde dicat:* Surrexit Xpistus, spes nostra; precedet uos in Galileam.

[1] MS, tradi.

Chorus cantet alios duos uersus sequentes residuos, et *interim recedant Maria* et *Peregrini*, et processio, *factis memoriis*, *redeat in choro*, et *ibi finiantur Vespere*.[1]

III

The third manuscript—Bibl. Nat. MS lat. 1213—from which I offer a series of texts is readily accessible and has been frequently referred to. In view of these frequent references and of the interest in the dramatic offices of Rouen, it is surprising that the pertinent parts of this manuscript have never been printed in full. The absence of complete printed texts from this manuscript is, perhaps, partly due to the fact that they follow rather closely similar Rouen texts already printed, but more probably to the fact that through erroneous statements and misleading references many have been led to believe that the pertinent texts are already in print.[2] On account of these misunderstandings and of the need of more accurate texts from Rouen, I venture to offer the following series of complete texts.

[OFFICIUM PASTORUM][3]

[P. 17] . . . . *Hodie*[4] *lectio* nona *Euangelium*: In principio erat uerbum. *Responsorium*: Verbum caro. *Versus*: In *principio*. Plenum. Gloria, et cetera. *Omnes presbyteri in superliciis sint in modum corone*

[1] The rubric, *Feria tertia*, follows immediately.

[2] See Bibliographical Note at the end of this article. The incidental remarks of E. Du Méril (*Les origines latines du théâtre moderne* [Paris, 1897], pp. 96, n. 1 and 147, n. 2) regarding this MS are entirely correct. Gasté (p. 4, n. 2) in his supposition, "Nous pensons que c'est là [*i. e.*, Bibl. Nat. MS lat. 1213] un des MSS consultés par dom Jean Le Prévost . . . . pour les variantes qu'il a mises en manchettes," is, I think, in error. H. Anz (*Die lateinischen Magierspiele* [Leipzig, 1905], p. 9) did no harm in ignoring this MS. P. Aubry (*La musique et les musiciens d'église en Normandie au XIIIe siècle* [Paris, 1906], p. 27, n.1) writes, "Le texte en [i. e., of the Rouen *Festum Asinorum*] a été publié par Du Cange dans le *Glossarium* à l'article *Festum Asinorum*, d'après un Ordinaire de l'église de Rouen du xve siècle, aujourd'hui à Paris, Bibl. Nat., lat. 1213, p. 24." As a matter of fact, the *Festum Asinorum* is found neither on the page indicated nor anywhere else in this MS. The same writer seems to imply (p. 29, n. 1) that the dramatic offices presented by Le Prévost (Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, CXLVII, 135–42) are taken from this same MS. This implication cannot, I think, be substantiated. A further discussion of these relations is presented in the Bibliographical Note below.

[3] B. N. MS lat. 1213, pp. 17, 18. For brief descriptions of this MS and for an indication of its history see *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Regiae*, Tom. III (Parisiis, 1744), p. 96, col. 1; L. Delisle, *Bibliotheca Bigotiana Manuscripta* (Rouen, 1887), p. 67; Gasté, p. 4, n. 2. The MS is of paper, measures 195×140 millimeters, and is bound in yellow leather. It contains A–H folios + 283 pages, folios A1–v, B1–v, and p. 284 being blank. It is written in a small cursive script of the fifteenth century. The MS contains no music. Its having been in use at Rouen is frequently stated in the text itself. Cf., for example, pp. 1, 5, 17, and 34.

[4] Christmas.

in medio chori, et *cantent prosam, et incipiatur sic:* Que[m] ethera *et terra*, et *chorus respondeat neuma. Finita prosa, quidam sacerdos reuestitus omnibus indumentis sacerdotalibus, cum ipso subdiaconus tunica reuestitus cantet ante altare Euangelium: Liber generacionis. Finito Euangelio, Dominus Archiepiscopus aut decanus uel alius de maioribus de dextro choro incipiat ante altare cum candelabro* et *turibulo: Te Deum laudamus.*

Finito Te Deum *laudamus, peragatur Officium Pastorum hoc modo*, secundum *usum Rothomagensem. Presepe sit paratum retro altare*, et *ymago Sancte Marie sit in eo posita. In primis quidam puer ante chorum in excelso in similitudinem angeli Natiuitatem*[1] Domini *nuncians ad quinque canonicos quindecim marcharum* et *librarum, uel ad* eos *uicarios de* secunda *sede, Pastores intrantes per magnum* [p. 18] *ostium chori per medium chorum transeuntes, tunicis et amictibus* [*indutos*], *hunc uersum ita dicens: Nolite timere, usque, In presepio. Sint plures pueri in uoltis ecclesie quasi Angeli, qui alta uoce incipiant:* Gloria *in* excelsis Deo, et *cantent usque*, Voluntatis. *Hoc audientes Pastores ad locum in quo paratum est Presepe accedant cantantes*[2] *hunc uersum*: Pax *in terris, totum. Quod dum intrauerint, duo presbyteri dalmaticati quasi Obstetrices*, qui *ad presepe fuerint dicant: Quem queritis, usque*, Dicite. *Pastores respondeant:* Saluatorem *Xpistum, usque, Angelicum. Item Obstetrices cortinam aperientes puerum demonstrent dicentes:* Adest *hic paruulus, usque*, Ysaias dixerat *propheta. Hic ostendant matrem pueri dicentes:* Salue *uirgo singularis, usque*, Frui *natus* uisione. *Deinde uertant se ad chorum redeuntes* et *dicentes:* Alle*luia*, alle*luia*, iam *uere* scimus, *usque*, Cum *propheta* dicentes.[3]

Hoc finito, incipiatur Missa, et *Pastores regant chorum*. *Dominus Archiepiscopus, si presens fuerit, cantet*[4] *Missam, aut decanus. Officium:* Dominus dixit ad me. *Psalmus:* Quare fre[muerunt]. Kyrie*leyson*, Rex genitor. Gloria *in* excelsis. *Pastores cantent prosam*: Que[m] ciues celici, *et cum uenerint ad locum ubi dicitur*, Suscipe[5] de*precationem* nostram, omnes *flectant genua uersus altare. Oratio*: Deus qui nos sacratissimam. *De beata Maria Oratio*: Deus qui salutis. *Quidam de Pastoribus cantet in pulpito lectionem:* Populus gentium. *Sine interuallo subdiaconus legat epistolam:* Apparuit gratia Dei saluatoris. *Duo Pastores de* secunda *sede Graduale*: Tecum principium. *Versus*: Dixit Dominus. *Reiteretur Graduale*: Tecum principium. *Duo de maiori sede:* Alle*luia*, Dominus dixit ad me. *Sequentia*: Nato canunt omnia. *Euangelium*: Exiit editum. Credo. *Offertorium*: Letentur celi. *Offerant*[6] omnes qui *uoluerint. Secreta*: Accepta *tibi* sit, Domine. *Alia Secreta*: Muneribus nostris. *Prefatio*: Quia per incarnati. *Hec*

[1] MS, natiuitatis.
[2] MS, cantores.
[3] MS, ducentes.
[4] MS, cantent.
[5] MS, Suscepe.
[6] MS, offerenda.

prescripta Prefatio dicatur omnibus festiuis diebus usque ad Purificationem, excepto die Epyphanie Domini, cum eius octauis. Communicantes et noctem sacratissimam dicatur. Sanctus et Agnus festiue. Communio: In splendoribus. Post-Communio: Da nobis, quesumus, Domine Deus noster. Alia Post-Communio: Hec nos communio. Ite missa est.

Finita Missa, Dominus archiepiscopus, uel alius dicat Versum: Benedictus qui uenit in nomine Domini. Versum: Deus Dominus, et cetera. Alleluia. Deus in adiutorium. Gloria patri. Sicut erat, et cetera. Alleluia. Archiepiscopus uel alius uersus ad Pastores dicat: Quem uidistis, pastores, dicite; annunciate nobis in terris qui[s] apparuit. *Pastores respondeant: Natum uidimus, et cetera, et totam antiphonam finiant. Dehinc incipiat quidam Pastor a dextra parte psalmum: Dominus regnauit. Antiphona: Quem uidistis. Pastores alias antiphonas incipiant, unusquisque suam secundum ordinem, et omnes cum neumis finiantur, et Pastores regant chorum. Antiphona: Genuit puerpera. Psalmus: Iubilate. Antiphona: Angelus ad pa*[stores]. *Psalmus: Deus, Deus. Antiphona: Facta est. Psalmus: Benedicite. Antiphona: Paruulus filius. Psalmus: Laudate. Capitulum: Populus gentium. Ymnus:* [p. 19] *A solis ortus cardine. Versus: Viderunt omnes fines. Antiphona sicut in Vesperis*[1] *ter repetatur: Gloria in excelsis Deo. Psalmus: Benedictus. Oratio: Concede quesumus omnipotens Deus. Benedicamus cantetur a Pastoribus: Verbum patris hodie. Quo finito, Pastores cantent hanc antiphonam totam in pulpito: Ecce completa. Archiepiscopus uel sacerdos dicat uersum: Post partum. Oratio: Deus qui salutis. Benedicamus, tres pueri.*[2]

[FESTUM INFANTUM][3]

[p. 24] . . . . *Ad Vesperas duo presbyteri regant chorum. Antiphone cum neumis finiantur. Antiphona: Tecum principium. Psalmus: Dixit Dominus, et cetera. Capitulum: Iocunditatem. Responsorium: In medio ecclesie. Omnes presbyteri, ut prenotatur in fe*[sto] *Sancti Stephani, Ymnus: Bina celestis, uel Letabundus. Versus: In* [omnem terram].[4] *Antiphona: In medio ecclesie. Psalmus: Magnificat. Oratio: Ecclesiam tuam. Benedicamus ad placitum presbyterorum. Sequantur*

[1] MS, uīs. This same abbreviation, in the same context, is found in Rouen MS Y. 110, fol. 23r, from which Gasté (p. 31) expands it to *voltis*. I expand into *uesperis* in accordance with the following rubric concerning the Antiphon of the *Magnificat* in First Vespers of Christmas (B. N. MS lat. 1213, p. 16): "Antiphona cum trina repetitione," which explains precisely the rubric, "Antiphona sicut in Vesperis ter repetatur," in the case before us. Gasté did not consider the similar rubric in First Vespers in Rouen MS Y 110, fol. 21r, "Antiphona cum trina repeticione."

[2] The words, Sequatur Missa de Luce, follow immediately.

[3] B. N. MS lat. 1213, pp. 24–27.

[4] The MS seems to have In az̄, which I cannot explain in this place.

*Me*morie *Nati*uitatis et *Sancti Stephani* tantum. *A*ntiphona: Pastores. *V*ersus: Verbum caro. *O*ratio: Concede, *quesumus*, omnipotens Deus. *A*ntiphona: Constitutus. *V*ersus: Gloria *et* ho[nore]. *O*ratio: Omnipotens sempiterne Deus. *Sequatur Processio*: Sancta *et* immaculata, *et sint* presbyteri *in superiore parte* processionis, *ut* supra *notatur in die* Sancti *Stephani*. *Hoc finito, duo pueri tunicis* et *amictibus induti, tenentes candelabra cum cereis ardentibus, et* omnes *pueri* ecclesie *in cappis tenentes cereos ardentes cum suo Episcopo exeant de uestiario bini* et *bini cantantes* responsorium: Centum quadraginta; *et, processione ordinata, ueniant per chorum* et *eant ad altare Innocentium*, et *ibi stationem faciant*, et *finiatur ibi;* et *tres pueri cantent*: Hi empti sunt. *Quo finito, sequatur* antiphona: Innocentes. *Tres pueri uersum*: Letamini. *Episcopus orationem*: Deus hodierna die. *In reditu* antiphona *uel* responsorium [p. 25] *de Sancta Maria ad placitum. Duo presbyteri cantent uersum*: Post partum. *Episcopus orationem*: Deus qui salutis. *Pueri dicant*: Benedicamus. *Sequatur Benedictio Episcopi*, et *dicat unus puer alta uoce*: Humiliate uos ad benedictionem, *et alii respondeant*: Deo gratias. *Benedictio*: Dominus omnipotens benedicat uos, et cetera.

Ad Completorium *A*ntiphona: Natus *est* nobis. *P*salmus: Cum inuocarem, et cetera, *sicut prenotatur in* Completorio *diaconorum*.

Nota, Frater. In crastino est Fe[*stum*] *Du*plex. *Inuit*atorium *Do*minus *Episcopus, cum eo duo pueri*: Venite adoremus. *P*salmus: Venite. *Y*mnus: *Sanctorum* meritis. *In* primo *N*octurno, *A*ntiphona: Herodes uidens. *P*salmus: Beatus uir. *A*ntiphona: Χρistus infans. *P*salmus: Quare fre[muerunt]. *A*ntiphona: Arridebat. *P*salmus: In Domino confido. *V*ersus: Letamine. *Et legantur* sex *lectiones de Sermone*: Zelus quo tendat, *et* tres *lectiones de Expositione, in cantu, ut* supra, a quodam *diacono*. *Do*minus *Episcopus legat* nonam *lectionem*. *Exp*ositio: Angelus Domini apparuit. *R*esponsorium: Sub altare. *V*ersus: Vidi sub altare. Quare. *R*esponsorium: Effuderunt sanguinem. *V*ersus: Vindica, Domine. In circuitu. *R*esponsorium: Dignus a dignis. *V*ersus: Accipiunt a Χρisto. Et innocens. Gloria. *In* secundo *N*octurno, *A*ntiphona: Norunt infantes *P*salmus: Domine, quis habitabit. *A*ntiphona: Erigitur itaque. *P*salmus: Conserua. *A*ntiphona: Dignus a dignis. *P*salmus: Domini est terra. *V*ersus: Exultent iusti. *R*esponsorium: Sub throno. *V*ersus: Sub altare Dei. Vindica. *R*esponsorium: Adorauerunt. *V*ersus: Venientes autem. Mittentes. *R*esponsorium *Do*minus *Episcopus, duo tunicati cum eo*: Norunt infantes. *V*ersus: Licuit sanguinem. Fiunt. Gloria, et cetera. *In* tertio *N*octurno, *A*ntiphona: Dicunt infantes. *P*salmus: Exultate iusti. *A*ntiphona: Licuit sanguinem. *P*salmus: Benedicam. *A*ntiphona: Vindica, Domine. *P*salmus: Deus, uenerunt. *V*ersus: Iusti autem *in*

perpetuum. Responsorium: Cantabant sancti. Versus: Sub throno. Et resona. Responsorium: Ambulabunt. Versus: Hi sunt qui cum mulieribus. Et non de[lebo]. Responsorium: Centum quadraginta. Versus: Hi empti. Hec responsoria dicantur in octaua, et fiant tercia responsoria: Isti sunt. Versus: Vindica. Quia. Responsorium: Isti sunt sancti. Versus: Hi sunt qui cum mulieribus. Ambulabunt.

Nota. Dum nona lectio legetur, pergant pueri ad uestiarium. Qua finita, exeant bini et bini cum cereis ardentibus cantantes responsorium: Centum quadraginta. Tres pueri cantent uersum et prosam; ante altare in modum corone illud finiant. Quo finito, incipiatur: Te Deum laudamus.

Quo finito, incipiantur ibi Laudes, et redeant ad chorum, et ibi in medio chori finiantur Matutine. Antiphona in Laudibus: Herodes iratus. Psalmus: Dominus regnauit. Antiphona: A bymatu et infra. Psalmus: Iubilate. Antiphona: Vox in rama. Psalmus: Deus, Deus. Antiphona: Sub throno. Psalmus: Benedicite. Tres pueri incipiunt in pulpito: Laudes reddant pueri. Psalmus: Laudate Dominum. Antiphona: Laudes reddant. Versus: Laudate eum. Antiphona: Laudes reddant, et sic chorus psalmum finiant. Pueri ad unumquemque uersum dicant: Laudes reddant. Capitulum: Vidi supra montem. Ymnus: Rex gloriose martyrum. Versus: Mirabilis. Antiphona: Hi sunt qui cum mulieribus. Psalmus: Benedictus. Oratio: Deus, cuius hodierna. Benedicamus, ad placitum puerorum. Sequatur Memoria Natiuitatis. Antiphona: Gaudeamus, ut supra. Versus: Iustus qui. Oratio: Omnipotens sempiterne Deus. Nota. In die Innocentium ad Matutinas incipiatur prima antiphona de nocte ad Memoriam Sancti Iohannis: Iohannes apostolus, et alie antiphone secundum ordinem. Versus: Valde honorandus. Oratio: Ecclesiam tuam. Sequatur processio ad altare Innocentium, cantando responsorium: Dignus a dignis, [p. 26] cum uersu; et regressu uersus ad placitum. Oratio: Deus qui licet. In reditu, de Sancta Maria antiphona uel responsorium ad placitum, ut prenotatur. Versus: Post partum. Oratio: Deus qui salutis, et cetera. Qua finita, pueri cum suo Episcopo ante maius altare cantantes ut supra notatur in die Sancti Stephani.

Ad Primam, Ymnus: Corde natus. Antiphona: Herodes iratus. Psalmus: Deus, in nomine, et cetera. Antiphona: Gratias.[1] Psalmus: Quicumque. Capitulum: Regi seculorum. Responsorium: Ihesu Xpiste. Alleluia, et cetera, ut supra.

Post Primam Benedictio Episcopi, ut supra. Sequatur Missa Matutina. Officium: Puer natus. Kyrieleyson et Gloria. Oratio: Concede, quesumus, omnipotens Deus. Memorie Sancte Marie, Sancti Stephani, et Sancti Johannis tantum. Epistola et Euangelium de secunda Missa

[1] A later hand has substituted, Te unum.

Natiuitatis. Cetera de Maiori Missa. Credo, *Sanctus*, et Agnus *festiue. Si Dominica fuerit, sequatur Aque Benedictio*, et post *Tertiam aspergatur. Et* post[*ea*] *sequatur Processio*, et *sit de Natiuitate secundum suum ordinem*, et *pueri in capis sint in superiori parte, ut supra notatur in die Sancti Stephani.*

Ad Tertiam, *Ymnus*: Corporis formam. *Antiphona*: A bymatu. *Psalmus*: Legem po[ne]. *Capitulum*: Vidi super montem. *Responsorium*. Letamini in Domino. Alleluia. *Versus*: Exultent. *Oratio*: Deus cuius hodierna.

Ad Missam, Officium. Omnes pueri in capis in medio chori regant chorum. Episcopus incipiat: Ex ore infantum. *Psalmus*: Domine, Dominus noster. Kyrieleyson et Gloria *festiue. Oratio*: Deus cuius hodierna. *Epistola in cantu cum Prosa, ut supra*: Vidi super montem. *Graduale pueri, ut prenotatur*: Anima nostra. *Versus*: Laqueus. *Episcopus, cum eo omnes pueri in modum corone*: Alleluia. Hi sunt qui cum. *Sequentiam Episcopus incipiat*: Celsa pueri. *Euangelium in cantu*: Angelus domini apparuit. *Credo. Offertorium*: Anima nostra, quod *incipiatur ab Episcopo*, et cetera omnia, *ut supra. Deinde offerant omnes qui uoluerint, ut supra notatur. Secreta*: Adesto, Domine, muneribus. *Prefatio*: Quia per incarnati. Sanctus *festiue. Communicantes.* Agnus *festiue. Communio*: Vox in rama. *Post-Communio*: Votiua, Domine.

Ad Sextam, *Ymnus*: Ecce quem uates. *Antiphona*: Vox in rama. *Psalmus*: Defecit. *Capitulum*: Ecce audiui. *Responsorium*: Exultent iusti. Alleluia. *Versus*: Iusti autem in perpetuum. *Oratio*: Deus cuius hodierna.

Ad Nonam, *Ymnus*: Iuste iudex. *Antiphona*: Cantabant sancti. *Psalmus*: Mirabilia. *Capitulum*: Et cantabant. *Responsorium*: Iusti autem in perpetuum. *Versus*: Mirabilis Deus. *Oratio*: Deus cuius hodierna

Ad Vesperas antiphone cum neumis finiantur. Antiphona: Tecum principium. *Psalmus*: Dixit Dominus, et cetera. *Capitulum*: Hi empti sunt. *Dominus Episcopus, cum eo duo tunicati*, responsorium: Iusti in perpetuum. *Versus*: Ideo accipient. Et cogitatio. Gloria laus, *apud ymnum*:[1] Sanctorum meritis, *uel* Letabundus. *Versus*: Letamini. *Antiphona*: O quam gloriosum. *Psalmus*: Magnificat. Et tamdiu cantetur: Deposuit potentes, quod baculus *accipiatur qui accipere, uoluerit. Vespere finiantur a dietario, et cantor tradat tres cappas rubeas tribus de maioribus qui regant chorum. Oratio*: Deus qui hodierna. Benedicamus Domino. *Sequatur Memorie Natiuitatis Domini, Sancti Stephani, Sancti Iohannis, ut prenotatur. Postea sequatur Processio*: Sancta et immaculata. *Qua finita, redeant ad altare Sancti Thome Martyris*, et *incipiatur* responsorium *ab uno de regentibus chorum*,

[1] MS, Ymnus.

responsorium: Igitur ductus est Thomas. *Tres regentes chorum uersum* [p. 27] *cantent ante altare:* Misertus. *V*ersus: Posuisti. *O*ratio: Deus, pro cuius ecclesiam. *In reditu de Sancta Maria. Ad placitum* Benedicamus *tres pueri.*

Ad Completorium *accendantur candelabra more triplici. A*ntiphona: Natus est nobis. *P*salmus: Cum inuocarem, et cetera. *Y*mnus: Saluator mundi. *V*ersus: Custodi nos. *A*ntiphona: Verbum caro. *P*salmus: Nunc dimittis, et cetera, *ut fieri solet.*

[OFFICIUM STELLAE][1]

[p. 34] *Officium Trium Regum secundum usum ecclesie Rothomagensis die Epyphanie.* Tertia *cantata, tres de maiore sede more regum induti, et debent esse scripti in tabula, ex tribus partibus ante altare conueniant cum suis famulis portantibus Regum oblationes induti tunicis* et *amictibus, et debent esse de* secunda *sede scripti in tabula ad placitum scriptoris. Ex*[2] *tribus Regibus medius ab oriente ueniens, stellam cum baculo ostendens, dicat alte:* Stella fulgore nimio.

Secundus Rex a dextra parte respondeat: Que regem regum.

Tertius Rex a sinistra parte dicat: Quem uenturum olim.

Tunc Magi ante altare sese osculentur, et simul cantent: Eamus *et* inquiramus.

Hoc finito, cantor incipiat responsorium: Magi ueniunt, et *moueat processio. V*ersus: Cum natus. *Sequatur aliud* responsorium, *si necesse fuerit:* Interrogabat magos. *Processione in naui ecclesie constituta, stationem faciant. Dum autem processio nauem ecclesie intrare ceperit, corona ante altare Crucis pendens in modo stelle, Magi Stellam ostendentes ad ymaginem Sancte Marie super altare Crucis prius positam cantantes pergant:* Ecce stella[3] *in* oriente.

Hoc finito, duo de maiori sede cum dalmaticis ex utraque parte altaris stantes suauiter respondeant: Qui sunt hi qui stella.[4]

Magi respondeant: Nos sumus quos cernitis.

Tunc duo dalmaticati aperientes cortinam dica[*n*]*t:* Ecce puer adest.

Tunc procidentes Reges ad terram simul salutent Puerum, ita dicentes: Salue princeps seculorum.

Tunc unus a suo famulo aurum accipiat et *dicat:* Suscipe rex aurum,

et offerat. Secundus Rex ita dicat et *offerat:* Tolle thus uere.

Tercius dicat et *offerat:* Mirram, signum sepulture.

Iterum fiant oblationes a clero et *populo. Tunc Magi*[*s*] *orantibus* et quasi *somno sopitis, quidam puer alba indutus* et *amictu super caput* quasi *Angelus in pulpito illis dicat hanc* antiphonam: Impleta sunt que

[1] B. N. MS lat. 1213, pp. 34, 35. [2] MS, et. [3] MS, stellā. [4] MS, stellā.

prophetie, et cetera. *Hoc finito Reges recedant per alam ecclesie ante fontes, et intrent chorum per ostium sinistrum, et processio intret chorum sicut consuetum est in Dominicis, cantore incipiente hoc responsorium:* Tria sunt munera. *Versus:* Salutis nostre auctor, *si necesse fuerit.*

Ad Missam tres Reges regant chorum, qui Kyrie, fons bonitatis, Alleluia, Sanctus, et Agnus *cantent. Officium:* Ecce aduenit. *Psalmus:* Deus iudicium. Kyrieleyson et Gloria *festiue. Oratio:* Deus qui hodierna die. *Si Archiepiscopus cantauerit, Memorie pro Domino Papa et Rege tantum; sine autem Alleluia Memorie fia[n]t. Epistola:* Surge illuminare. *Predicti famuli cantent Graduale:* Omnes de Sabba. *Versus:* Surge illuminare. Alleluia. *Versus:* Vidimus stellam. *Sequencia:* Epyphaniam Domino. *Euangelium:* Cum natus esset Ihesus. *Credo. Offertorium:* Reges Tharsis. *Deinde offerant Reges, et omnes qui uoluerint. Secreta:* Ecclesie tue, quesumus, Domine. *Prefatio:* [p. 35] Quia cum Unigenitus. Communicantes et diem. Communio: Vidimus stellam. Post-Communio: Presta, quesumus, omnipotens Deus. Prefatio et Communicantes dicantur per octauam; etiam *ad Missam Beate Marie.*

Ad Sextam, *Ymnus:* Ecce quem uates. *Antiphona:* Apertis thesauris. *Psalmus:* Defecit. *Capitulum:* Et ambulabunt gentes. *Responsorium:* Reges Tharsis. Alleluia. *Versus:* Adorate Dominum. *Oratio:* Deus qui hodierna die.

Ad Nonam, *Ymnus:* Iuste iudex. *Antiphona:* Stella ista. *Psalmus:* Mirabilis. *Capitulum:* Filii tui de longe. *Responsorium:* Adorate Dominum. Alleluia. *Versus:* Omnes gentes. *Oratio:* Deus qui hodierna die.

Ad Vesperas, Antiphona: Tecum principium. *Psalmus:* Dixit Dominus, et cetera, secundum suum ordinem. *Capitulum:* Inundatio camelorum. *Responsorium:* In columbe specie. *Versus:* Vox Domini. *Ymnus:* A patre Unigenitus, uel Letabundus. *Versus:* Omnes de Sabba. *Antiphona:* Ab oriente. *Psalmus:* Magnificat. *Oratio:* Deus qui hodierna die. *Nulla memoria.*

Ad Completorium, *ut heri.*

[OFFICIUM SEPULCHRI][1]

[p. 86] . . . . *Responsorium:*[2] Dum transisset sabbatum. *Versus:* Et ualde. Ut uenientes. Gloria. Alleluia.

Finito tertio responsorio, *Officium Sepulchri ita celebratur. Tres diaconi de maiori sede, induti dalmaticis et amictus habentes super*

[1] B. N. MS lat. 1213, p. 86. This text has already been presented by C. Lange, *Die lateinischen Osterfeiern* (München, 1887), pp. 155–57. Certain obvious errors in Lange's text together with the desirability of giving the complete series of dramatic offices in MS 1213 will probably justify my offering a new text of this *Officium Sepulchri.*

[2] Third Respond of Easter Matins.

capita sua ad similitudinem mulierum, uascula tenentes in manibus ueniant per medium chori, et uersus Sepulcrum[1] *properantes ultibus submissis cantent pariter hunc uersum: Quis* reuoluet nobis lapidem?

Hoc finito, quidam puer quasi Angelus, indutus alba et amictus, tenens spicam in manu, ante Sepulcrum dicat: Quem queritis *in* sepulcro?

Marie respondeant: Ihesum Nazarenum crucifixum.

Tunc Angelus dicat: Non est hic, surrexit enim,

Et locum digito ostendens. *Hoc finito, Angelus citissime discedat,* et *duo presbyteri de maiori sede in tunicis intus Sepulchrum residentes dicant:* Mulier, quid ploras?

Medius trium Mulierum respondeat, *ita dicens: Quia* tulerunt Dominum meum.

Duo residentes dicant: Quem queritis, mulieres?

Marie osculentur locum; *postea exeant de Sepulcro. Interim quidam sacerdos de maiori sede in* persona Domini, *albatus cum stolla, tenens crucem obuians eis, in sinistro cornu altaris dicat:* Mulier, quid ploras? Quem queris?

Medius Mulier[2] *dicat:* Domine, si sustulisti eum, dicito mihi.

Sacerdos illi crucem ostendens *dicat:* Maria!

Quod cum audierit, pedibus eius citissime[3] *sese offerat,* et *alta uoce dicat:* Raboni!

Sacerdos innuens manu dicat: Noli me tangere.

Hoc finito, sacerdos in dextro cornu altaris iterum appareat, et illis transeuntibus ante altare dicat: Auete, nolite timere.

Hoc finito, se abscondat, et Mulieres, hoc audito, lete inclinent ad altare, et conuerse *ad chorum hunc uersum cantent:* Alleluia, resurrexit Dominus,[3] alleluia.

Hoc finito, Dominus *Archiepiscopus uel sacerdos ante altare cum turibulo incipiat alte:* Te Deum laudamus, *et sine neuma finiatur. Versus:* Resurrexit Dominus uere. Deus *in adiutorium*[4] . . . .

[OFFICIUM PEREGRINORUM][5]

[p. 90] . . . . *Ad Vesperas,*[6] *sicut in die Pasce, duo de maioribus in capis:* Salue festa dies, *cum processione, ut* supra. Kyrieleyson, *ut* supra. Alleluia. *Psalmus:* Dixit Dominus. *Psalmus:* Confitebor, et cetera. *Duo de* secunda *sede regant chorum. Graduale:* Hec dies. *Versus: Dicant nunc Israel. Duo de maiori sede:* Alleluia. Nonne cor nostrum. *Versus:* Surrexit Dominus. *Antiphona:* Et coegerunt. *Psalmus:* Magnificat. *Oratio:* Deus qui hodierna die. *Duo de* secunda *sede:* Benedicamus Domino. Alleluia. *Nulla memoria nisi fuerit fe*[*sti*], *ut*

[1] MS, sepulcri.
[2] Lange, mulierum.
[3] Omitted by Lange.
[4] The beginning of Laudes.
[5] B. N. MS lat. 1213, p. 90.
[6] Vespers of Easter Monday.

supra. *Sequatur Processio ad Fontes, ut supra. Oratio:* Concede, quesumus, o[mnipotens] Deus. *In reditu:* Alleluia. *Psalmus:* In exitu, et cetera, *ut supra.*

Nota, Fili. Officium Peregrinorum debet hic fieri hoc modo. Duo de secunda *sede, qui sint scripti in tabula ad placitum scriptoris, induti tunicis* et *desuper capis, transuersum portantes baculos* et *peras in similitudinem Peregrinorum,* et *habeant capellos super capita,* et *sint barbati. Exeant de uestiario cantantes ymnum:* Ihesu, nostra redemptio. *Venientes lento pede per dextram alam ecclesie usque ad portas occidentales,* et *subsistent in capite processionis.* Et *cum cantauerint ymnum usque ad eum locum:* Nos tuo uultu saties, *tunc quidam sacerdos de maiori sede scriptus in tabula, indutus alba* et *amictus nudus pedes, ferens crucem super dextrum humerum, uultu demisso ueniens usque ad eos per dextram alam ecclesie* et *subito stet inter illos* et *dicat:* Qui sunt hi sermones?

Peregrini quasi admirantes et *eum respicientes dica[n]t:* Tu solus peregrinus es.

Sacerdos interroget: Que?

Peregrini respondeant: De Ihesu Nazareno.

Sacerdos utrimque respiciens dicat: O stulti *et* tardi corde.

Quibus dictis, statim recedens sacerdos fingens se longius ire, et *Peregrini festinantes prosequientes eum detineant quasi ad hospicium inuitantes et trahentes, baculis ostendentes Castellum,* et *dicentes:* Mane nobiscum.

Et ita cantantes ducant eum usque ad tabernaculum in medio nauis ecclesie in similitudinem Castelli Emaux preparatum. Quo cum ascenderint et ad mensam ibi paratam sederint, et Dominus *inter eos sedens panem eis fregerit,* et *fractione panis agnitus ab*[1] *illis, subito recedens ab oculis eorum euanescat. Illi autem quasi stupefacti surgentes, uersis uultibus inter ipsos cantent lamentabiliter:* Alleluia, *cum uersu:* Nonne cor nostrum. *Quo reiterato, uertent se uersus pulpitum* et *cante[n]t hunc uersum:* Dic nobis, Maria.

Tunc quidam de maiori sede indutus dalmatica et *amictu, in modum mulieris caput circumligatus, respondeat:*

Sepulcrum Xρisti.
Angelicos testes.

Tunc ostendat unam sindonem et *explicet ex una parte loco sudarii,* et *aliam ex alia parte loco uestium,* et *proiciat ante magnum ostium chori. Deinde dicat:* Su[r]rexit Xρistus

Chorus cantet alios duos uersus sequentes residuos, et interim recedа[n]t Maria et *Peregrini; et processio, memoriis factis, redeat in choro,* et *ibi finiantur Vespere.*[2]

[1] MS, uel. [2] The rubric, *Completorium*, follows immediately.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

The following is a list, with some criticism, of the most important manuscripts and prints bearing upon the subject of the liturgico-dramatic offices of Rouen.

1. Rouen MS 384 (Y. 110), Ordinarium Rothomagense saec. xiv.
   a) *Officium Pastorum*, fol. 22^{r}–23^{r}, printed by Gasté, pp. 25–32.
   b) *Festum Asinorum*, fol. 33^{r}–35^{r}, printed by Gasté, pp. 4–20.
   c) *Officium Infantum*, fol. 28^{r}–28^{v}, extracts in Gasté, pp. 35, 36.
   d) *Officium Stellae*, fol. 38^{v}–39^{r}, printed by Gasté, pp. 49–52.
   e) *Officium Sepulchri*, fol. 82^{v}–83^{v}, printed by Gasté, pp. 58–62, and inaccurately presented by Lange, pp. 155–57, where some of the variants from this MS are appended to an inaccurate text from Bibl. Nat. MS lat. 1213.
   f) *Officium Peregrinorum*, fol. 86^{r}–86^{v}, printed by Gasté, pp. 65–68.

2. Rouen MS 382 (Y. 108), Ordinarium Rothomagense saec. xv.
   a) *Officium Pastorum*, fol. 23^{r}–24^{r}.
   b) *Officium Infantum*, fol. 28^{r}–29^{r}.
   c) *Festum Asinorum*, fol. 31^{v}–33^{r}.
   d) *Officium Stellae*, fol. 35^{v}–36^{r}.
   e) *Officium Sepulchri*, fol. 70bis^{v}–71^{r}.
   f) *Officium Peregrinorum*, fol. 73^{r}–73^{v}.

In printing the corresponding six texts from Rouen MS 384 (Y. 110) Gasté gives occasional variants from MS 382 (Y. 108), but by no means all of them. In assuming that MS 382 (Y. 108) is a copy of MS 384 (Y. 110) Gasté (p. 2) may be right; in which case the copyist departed at times rather widely from his model. See, for example, Gasté, p. 51, n. 1.

3. Bibl. Nat. MS lat. 1213, Ordinarium Rothomagense saec. xv.
   a) *Officium Pastorum*, pp. 17–18.
   b) *Officium Infantum*, pp. 25–27.
   c) *Officium Stellae*, pp. 34, 35.
   d) *Officium Sepulchri*, p. 86, printed by Lange, pp. 155–57.
   e) *Officium Peregrinorum*, pp. 90, 91.

These five texts are printed in the present article. Monsieur Pierre Aubry is certainly wrong in his assertion (*La musique et les musiciens d'église en Normandie au XIII^{e} siècle* [Paris, 1906], p. 27, n. 1) that this MS contains a text of the *Festum Asinorum*.

4. Montpellier MS H. 304, Miscellanea saec. xii.
   a) *Officium Pastorum*, fol. 41^{r}–41^{v}, printed above.
   b) *Officium Stellae* (incomplete), fol. 41^{v}–42^{v}, printed above. Extracts in Gasté, pp. 54–56.

5. Bibl. Nat. MS. lat. 904, Graduale Rothomagense saec. xiii.
   a) *Officium Pastorum*, fol. 11^{v}–12^{v}, printed by E. de Coussemaker, *Les drames liturgiques du moyen âge* (Rennes, 1860), pp. 235–41.
   b) *Officium Stellae*, fol. 28^{v}–30^{r}, printed by Coussemaker, pp. 242–49.
   c) *Officium Sepulchri*, fol. 101^{v}–102^{v}, printed by Coussemaker, pp. 250–55; by G. Milchsack, *Die lateinischen Osterfeiern* (Wolfenbüttel, 1880), p. 133; and by Lange, pp. 155–57.
6. Rouen MS 222 (A. 551), Processionale Rothomagense saec. xiii.
   a) *Officium Stellae* (incomplete), fol. 4^{r}–4^{v}, printed above.
   b) *Officium Peregrinorum*, fol. 43^{r}–45^{r}, printed above.
7. Bibl. Nat. MS lat. 1232, Ordo Romanus saec. xii.

At the back of this MS are inserted two folios in paper, numbered fol. 26 and 27. On fol. 26^{r}–27^{r} a hand of the seventeenth century has written a text of the *Festum Asinorum*, followed (fol. 27^{r}) by the note, in the same hand, "Haec supra scripta deprompta fuerunt ex antiquo codice Rituali S. Rotom. Ecclesiae, in Festo Circumcisionis Domini." This text agrees exactly with the text of the *Festum Asinorum* in Rouen MS 384 (Y. 110).

8. The texts communicated in *Joannis Abrincensis Episcopi deinde Rotomagensis Archiepiscopi Liber De Officiis Ecclesiasticis, Notis D. Johannis Prevotii . . . . illustratus*, Rotomagi, 1679. (The reprint of this work by Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, Vol. CXLVII, is accurate in all the points in which I refer to it.)
   a) *Officium Infantum*, pp. 202–5 (Migne, CXLVII, 135, 136).
   b) *Officium Stellae*, pp. 206–10 (Migne, CXLVII, 135–40).
   c) *Officium Sepulchri*, pp. 211–15 (Migne, CXLVII, 139–42).

Regarding his sources Le Prévost writes at the head of his *Officium Infantum*, "Ex ordin. MS Bigot.;" at the head of each of the other two *officia* he writes, "Ex ordinario et libro offic. MSS: bibliothecae Bigotianae." Various misstatements have been current as to the identification of these MSS. Gasté suggested (pp. 3, 4) that Le Prévost took the music for the *Officium Stellae* and the *Officium Sepulchri* from the parallel texts in Bibl. Nat. MS lat. 904, and (p. 4, n. 2) that Bibl. Nat. MS lat. 1213 is "un des MSS. consultés par dom Jean Le Prévost . . . . pour les variantes qu'il a mises en manchettes." (Le Prévost's "side-notes" are faithfully preserved in square brackets in Migne's reprint.) Chambers (*Mediaeval Stage*, II, 45, n. 3), referring to Gasté, says that Le Prévost's *Officium Stellae* is "from B. N. 904 and B. N. lat. 1213." P. Aubry (*op. cit.*, p. 29, n. 1) squarely implies that the dramatic offices presented by Le Prévost are transcriptions from Bibl. Nat. MS lat. 1213.

I have compared Le Prévost's dramatic offices with the two Paris MSS mentioned by Gasté, Chambers, and Aubry, and I present the following results:

a) Le Prévost's texts are almost identical with the texts in Bibl. Nat. MS lat. 1213. His departures from this MS may be illustrated by the following comparison:

"Et moveat processio. Sequatur aliud responsorium si necesse fuerit" (Migne, CXLVII, 137).

"Et moveat processio, versus: *Cum natus.* Sequatur aliud responsorium si necesse fuerit" (MS 1213, p. 34).

b) In direct contradiction to Gasté's conjecture I must report that I do not find a single case in which Le Prévost's "variantes . . . . mises en manchettes" could have been taken from MS 1213. Nearly all (but not all) of Le Prévost's "side-notes" agree with readings found in B. N. MS lat. 904.

c) The melodies accompanying Le Prévost's texts agree exactly with the melodies that accompany the corresponding texts in B. N. MS lat. 904.

In view of these observations, and in view of the fact that Le Prévost's texts do not agree exactly with the Rouen MSS Y. 110, Y. 108, and 222 (A. 551), or with Montpellier MS H. 304, I believe that at present the exact source of his texts cannot be demonstrated.

9. Du Cange, *Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis*, 7 Vols., Parisiis 1840–46.
   a) *Officium Pastorum*, V, 129. This text of Du Cange is the basis of the text given as "Rouen, XIV Century" by C. Davidson, *Studies in the English Mystery Plays* (New Haven, 1892), pp. 50–52, where, however, Du Cange is "amplified from Weinhold and Du Méril."
   b) *Festum Innocentium*, III, 960–61.
   c) *Festum Asinorum*, III, 255.
   d) *Officium Stellae*, VI, 367. I suppose that this text is the basis of the *Officium Regum Trium* given by Davidson, pp. 52–64.
   e) *Officium Sepulchri*, VI, 195.
   f) *Officium Peregrinorum*, V, 201.

The *b*), *d*), and *e*) of Du Cange do not agree with the corresponding texts communicated by Le Prévost, nor do the six texts agree exactly with any of the MSS discussed above. In each case, Du Cange says that his text is taken from an "Ordinarius MS," of Rouen. Petit de Julleville (*Les Mystères* [Paris, 1880], p. 37) says that the MS from which Du Cange printed his *Festum Asinorum* is lost. He adds that this last MS must have been written after 1350. P. Aubry (*op. cit.*, p. 27, n. 1) is certainly wrong in his assertion that Du Cange's text of the *Festum Asinorum* comes from Bibl. Nat. MS lat. 1213, p. 24.

10. E. Martène, *De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus*, 4 Vols. (Antuerpiae, 1736–38).
   a) *Officium Pastorum*, III, 96.
   b) *Officium Stellae*, III, 122, 123.

The Rouen MSS used are not exactly indicated. These texts agree exactly neither with any of the MSS mentioned above nor with the corresponding texts of Du Cange. Martène's *Officium Stellae* agrees in part with the corresponding text of Le Prévost, and in part with the variants offered by Le Prévost.

11. E. Du Méril, *Les origines latines du théâtre moderne* (Paris, 1897).
    a) *Officium Peregrinorum*, pp. 117–20.
    b) *Officium Sepulchri*, pp. 96–98.
    c) *Officium Pastorum*, pp. 147–50.
    d) *Officium Stellae*, pp. 153–56.

The manuscript bases of these four texts are exceedingly uncertain. For a serious criticism of Du Méril's four texts see Gasté, pp. 2, 3. Cf. Petit de Julleville, I, pp. 26, n. 1, and 61, n. 1.

In discussing the liturgico-dramatic offices of Rouen, scholars would probably do well to refer, as far as possible, to more authoritative texts than those of Le Prévost, Du Cange, Martène, and Du Méril.

12. The complete disappearance of all Rouen *Troparia* is greatly to be deplored by students of mediaeval dramatic origins. That the Cathedral of Rouen formerly possessed *Troparia* is shown by inventories of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. See *Revue de l'Art Chretien*, 1886, pp. 456, 466.

KARL YOUNG

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

ABLAUT-RELATIONS IN THE WEAK VERB IN GOTHIC, OLD HIGH GERMAN, AND MIDDLE HIGH GERMAN

PART II

CLASS I

322. MHG. *dīen*, *tīen* 'saugen, säugen': Goth. *daddjan*, OHG. *tāen*, Aust.-Bav. *deien:* MHG. *tigen* 'saugen.'

323. OHG. *jīēn* 'hassen': Goth. *fijan*, OHG. *figidōn* 'hassen,' Goth. *fijaþwa* 'feindschaft,' *fijands* 'feind,' cf. Goth. *faian* redup.? 'tadeln, anfeinden.'

324. MHG. *vīlen* 'feilen,' OHG. *fīhala* 'feile': OHG. *fihelōn*, *figilōn*, MHG. *vigelen* 'feilen.'

325. Goth. *bi-faihōn* 'übervorteilen,' OHG. *feihnōn* 'betrügerei treiben,' Goth. *faih* 'betrug,' *filufaihs* 'sehr bunt,' OHG. *feigi* 'dem tode verfallen,' *feihhan* 'arglist': OE. *ficol* 'unbeständig,' E. *fickle.* Connected with *vīlen* above?

326. Goth. *freidjan* 'schonen,' OHG. *vrīten* 'hegen, hätscheln,' ON. *frīða* 'schmücken, zieren.' Cf. Goth. *freis* 'frei,' MHG. *vrīen* 'freien, um eine braut werben,' Goth. *gafriþōn* 'versöhnen,' OHG. *gefridōn*, MHG. *gevriden*, *vridigen* 'beschützen,' OHG. *fridu* 'friede,' Goth. *frijōn* 'lieben.'

327. MHG. *gīten*, *gītesen* 'gierig sein, geizen,' OHG. *gītag*, MHG. *gītec* 'gierig, geizig,' OHG. *gīt* 'habgier, geiz': Goth. *gaidw* 'mangel.'

328. MHG. *gīlen* 'betteln,' MLG. *gīlen* 'begehren, betteln,' *gīl* 'schlund, kehle, begehren, gier': ON. *geil* 'kluft': *gil* 'kluft.'

329. Goth. *usgeisnan* 'von sinnen kommen, sein; sich entsetzen': *usgaisjan* 'erschrecken, von sinnen bringen,' ON. *geisa* 'wüten.' Cf. OE. *gāst*, OHG. *geist.*

330. OE. *gīwian* 'ask, beg,' *gīw* 'vulture': OHG. *giwēn*, MHG. *giwen* 'gähnen.' Cf. OHG. *gīen* 'gähnen,' OE. *gīnan* st. v. No. 7

331. MHG. *grīs* 'greis, grau,' OE. *ā-grīsan* 'shudder': MLG. *grisen* 'grausen, schaudern,' MHG. *grisgramen* 'zähne

knirschen vor unmut,' *grisgen* 'knirschen, crunch, crackle,' *gristen* 'zerreiben, zermalmen.'

332. OHG. *heizēn* 'heiss sein, werden,' OHG., MHG. *heizen* 'heiss machen, erhitzen': OHG. *hizzōn*, MHG. *hizen* 'heiss werden,' *hitzen*, *hitzegen* 'erhitzen, heiss machen.'

333. OHG. *leinan*, MHG. *leinen* 'lehnen,' Goth. *hlains* 'hügel': OHG. *hlinēn*, MHG. *linen* 'lehnen, sich stützen,' OHG. *hlina* 'lehne.'

334. OHG. (*h*)*rīdōn*, MHG. *rīden* 'zittern,' OHG. *rīdo* 'zittern': MHG. *rideren*, *ridwen* 'zittern,' OE. *hriðjan* 'im fieber sein,' OHG. (*h*)*rito*, MHG. *rite* 'fieber.'

335. OHG. *hrīs* 'reis, zweig': MHG. *reisten* 'als verkohlter teil abfallen, sprühen,' ON. *hreistra* 'to cover with scales': Goth. *afhrisjan* 'abschütteln,' OE. *hrisian* 'schütteln,' *hristlan* 'rustle,' ON. *hrista* 'schütteln.'

336. OHG. *hweiōn*, MHG. *weien* 'wiehern': OHG. *wihōn* MHG. *wihen*, *wihelen*, *wiheren*, *wihenen* 'wiehern.' Cf. OE. *hwīnan* st. v. 'whine,' OHG. *winsōn*, MHG. *winsen* 'jammern,' *winseln* 'winseln' from **hwī̆*.

337. Goth. *ga-hweitjan*, OHG. *hwīzjan* 'weiss machen,' *wīzēn* MHG. *wīzen* 'weiss werden,' *wīzegen* 'weiss anstreichen,' Goth. *hweits*, OHG., MHG. *wīz*, 'weiss': Goth. *hwaiteis*, OHG. *hweizi* 'weizen.'

338. Swed. dial. *eilen* 'vom stumpf werden der zähne,' *eil* 'stumpf': MHG. *ilgern* 'vom stumpf werden der zähne.'

339. OHG. [*gan-eistjan*] *gneistan*, MHG. *ganeisten*, *gneisten* 'funken sprühen,' OHG. *ganeheista*, *gneista*, MHG. *geneist* 'funke': MHG. *gnistern*, *gnitzern* 'funken sprühen.'

340. MHG. *kīchen* 'schwer atmen, keuchen,' MHG. *kīche* 'asthma': Sw. *kikna* 'fast ersticken, keuchen.'

341. MHG. *kīlen* 'keilen,' OHG., MHG. *kīl* 'keil': cf. ON. *keiler* 'keil.'

342. ON. *kīta* 'quarrel, quibble': OE. *kitelian*, ON. *kitla*, OHG. *chizilōn*, MHG. *kitzeln* 'tickle.' Cf. Wood, *Color Names*, p. 54.

343. ON. *klīna* 'smear': MHG. *beklenen* 'beschmieren.' Cf. OHG. *klenan* st. v. 'schmieren, kleben.'

344. ON. *krīa* 'meerschwalbe: OE. *crā* 'croaking,' OHG. *chreia* 'kranich,' *krāen* 'krähen.'

345. Goth. *bi-laigōn* 'belecken': OE. *liccian*, OHG. *leccōn*, MHG. *lecken* 'lecken.'

346. Goth. *lubja-leis* 'gift-kundig': *lais* pret. pres. 'ich weiss,' *laisjan*, OHG. *lēran*, MHG. *lēren* 'lehren,' OHG. *leisa*, MHG. *leise* 'geleis, spur.' Cf. the following.

347. MHG. *līsten* 'mit einem saum versehen': Goth. *afar-laistjan* 'nachfolgen,' *laists* 'spur,' OHG. *folleistjan* 'providere,' MHG. *leisten* 'eine pflicht tun': OHG. *listen* 'schmeicheln,' MHG. *belisten* 'durch list zu stande bringen,' Goth. *lists* 'list.' Cf. OHG. *lirnēn*, *lernēn*, MHG. *lernen*, *lirnen* 'lernen.' Cf. No. 346.

348. Goth. *ga-naitjan* 'lästern,' *naiteins* 'lästerung,' OHG. *neizzan*, MHG. *geneizen* 'plagen.' Cf. Goth. *neiþ*, OHG. *nīd* 'neid, groll,' OHG. *nīdan* st. 'hassen.'

349. Norw. dial. *sīkja* (st. & w.) 'sickern, abseihen,' OE. *sīc* 'watercourse,' ON. *sīk* 'graben, grube,' MHG. *sīhte* 'seicht, untief': OHG. *seichan*, MHG. *seichen* 'harnen,' *seich* 'harn': OE. *sicerian*, NHG. *sickern* 'langsam fliessen,' Norw. *sikle* 'geifern, speicheln.'

350. OE. *sālnes* 'silence': Goth. *ana-silan* 'still werden.'

351. Goth. *insailjan* 'an seilen hineinlassen,' MHG. *seilen* 'seile machen,' OHG. *seil:* OHG. *silo* 'riemenwerk,' MHG. *sil.* Cf. ON. *sīme*, OE. *sīma* 'strick,' OHG. *seito* 'schlinge,' MHG. *seite* 'strick, saite,' *seiten* 'mit saiten beziehen.'

352. MHG. *smeichen*, *smeicheln* 'schmeicheln': *smicken*, *sminken* 'schminken,' E. *smicker* 'liebäugeln.' Norw. dial. *smīkja* st. 'sich einschmeicheln' by analogy.

353. MHG. *stīf* 'steif': *stivelen*, '*stivel* antun,' *stivel* 'stütze für den weinstock,' NHG. *stift.*

354. MHG. *strīfen* 'streifen,' *strīfe* 'streifen,' *strīfeht* 'gestreift,' *strīfeln* 'gestreift machen': *streifen* 'streifen,' *streif* 'streifen,' *streifeht* 'gestreift': *erstriffeln* 'durchstreifen,' *striffel*, *strif* 'streifen.'

355. OHG. *sweizzan*, MHG. *sweizen* 'schweiss vergiessen,' OHG. *sweizen* 'braten, rösten,' MHG. *sweitzen* 'in glühhitze aneinander hämmern': OHG. *swizzen* 'schwitzen,' MHG. *switzen.*

356. MHG. *zīlen* 'in form von linien verzieren,' OHG. *zīla* 'zeile': Goth. *gatilōn* 'erzielen, erlangen,' OHG. *zilōn*, *zilēn*, MHG. *zilen* 'sich beeilen, feststellen,' *verziln* 'an einen ort bestellen,' Goth. *gatils* 'passend,' OHG. *zil* 'ziel.'

357. OHG. *zweiōn*, MHG. *zweien* 'in zwei teile zerlegen': OHG. *zwiōn*, MHG. *zwien* 'in zwei teile zerlegen.'

358. OHG. *wiaga* 'wiege': MHG. *weigen* 'schwanken,' Swiss *weiggen*, *waicken* 'wackelnd bewegen.'

359. Goth. *fulla-weisjan* 'überzeugen,' *gaweisōn*, OHG. *wīsōn*, *wīsēn*, MHG. *wīsen* 'nach einem sehen, besuchen,' OHG. *wīssan*, MHG. *wīsen* 'anweisen, zeigen': OHG. *gewissōn*, MHG. *gewissen* 'gewiss machen.' Cf. Goth. *inweitan*, *witan*, OHG. *wizzan*, etc., and MLG. *wīsen* sometimes strong.

CLASS II

360. MHG. *pūke*, *būke* 'pauke': MHG. *bochen*, *puchen* 'trotzen, pochen.' Cf. ON. *bauka* 'lärmen.'

361. MHG. *biuhsen* 'aufblähen,' probably connected with MHG. *būch* 'bauch,' ON. *būkr* 'körper': MHG. *buch* 'keule,' *buckel.*

362. OHG. *būlla*, *pūlla*, MHG. *biule* 'beule': Goth. *uf-bauljan* 'aufschwellen machen,' ON. *baula* 'bellow.'

363. MHG. *briustern* 'anschwellen,' OE. *brēost*, OS. *briost* 'brust': MHG. *brüsten* 'mit einer brust versehen, sich brüsten,' OS. *brustian* 'sprossen, bruch machen,' Goth. *brusts* 'brust.'

364. MHG. *brūsen* 'brausen,' OE. *brīesan* 'bruise, crush,' MHG. *brūsche*, *brūs* 'brausen,' *brūseln* 'knistern': OHG. *brōsma* 'bröckchen, krume,' ON. *breyskr* 'gebrechlich, schwach,' *breysta* 'krachen': OE. *brosnian* 'crumble, decay; perish.' Cf. MHG. *brüelen;* may be distantly related.

365. MHG. *bœren* 'erheben' zu *bōr* 'trotz': OHG. *purjan*, *burren*, MHG. *buren*, *bürn* 'erheben' zu *bor* 'höhe,' OHG. *kipurjan*, MHG. *gebürn* 'geschehen, gebühren,' MG. *urborn* 'als zinsgut inne haben.'

366. Goth. *ga-diupjan* 'tief machen,' MHG. *tiefen* 'in die tiefe senken,' Goth. *diups*, OHG. *tiof*, MHG. *tief* 'tief': Goth. *daupjan*, OHG. *toufan*, MHG. *toufen* 'taufen.' Cf. OE. *dūfan*,

dȳfan, ON. *dȳfa: deyfa* 'tauchen': E. *dub* 'wasserloch,' OHG. *tupfen* 'tunken,' *topho* 'kreisel.'

367. Goth. *dius* 'wildes tier': MHG. *tūsch* 'spass, schelmerei,' *tiuschen* 'sein gespött mit jemandem treiben,' *tiuscher* 'täuscher': MHG. *tōren* 'ein tor sein,' *tœren* 'zu einem toren machen,' *tœrischen* 'närrische dinge treiben': MHG. *vertuschen* 'bedecken, verheimlichen,' OHG. *tusig*, OE. *dysig* 'töricht,' E. *dizzy:* MHG. *twās* 'tor, narr,' *getwās* 'gespenst,' OE. *dwœs* 'dull, stupid.' Cf. OE. *dust* 'staub,' Sw. *duska* 'rieseln, nebeln,' MLG. *dusich* 'betäubt, schwindelig,' *dusen* 'schlendern, bummeln,' *dwasen* 'unsinn reden.'

368. OE. *drūgoð* 'drought,' *drūgian* 'trocknen,' *drȳge* 'dry': ON. *draugr* 'a dry log': OHG. *artruknēn*, MHG. *truckenen* 'trocken werden,' *trückenen* 'trocken machen,' OHG. *truchan* 'trocken.'

369. OHG. *tūmōn* 'sich herumdrehen, taumeln,' *tūmilōn*, MHG. *tūmelen* 'sich herumdrehen': OHG. *toumen*, MHG. *toumen* 'dampfen, duften,' OHG. *toum* 'dampf': OHG. *tum?* 'listige wendung, stropha.' Cf. MHG. *tunsten* 'dunsten, dampfen,' OMHG. *tumel* 'lärm,' MHG. *tumben* 'sich taumeln,' OE. *tumbian* 'springen, purzeln.'

370. OHG. *tūzen*, *dūzen* 'stillen,' MHG. *tūzen* 'still trauern, sich still verhalten': MHG. *tützen* 'zum schweigen bringen,' *getotzen* 'zur ruhe kommen,' *tuzzen* 'verbergen, pressen, drücken,' OE. *dyttan* 'shut (ears), stop (mouth).'

371. MHG. *vlūdern: vlōdern*, *vlöudern* 'flattern.' Cf. MHG. *flōder*, *vlūder* 'fliessen, fluten,' *flōdartocken*, *flūdertocken* 'flattern.'

372. Goth. *fūls*, OHG. *fūl*, MHG. *vūl* 'faul,' OHG. *irfūlēn*, MHG. *ervūlen* 'faul werden, verfaulen,' MHG. *erviulen* 'verfaulen lassen': ON. *feyja* 'verfaulen lassen.'

373. MHG. *giegen* 'äffen,' *giege* 'narr': OHG. *gougelan*, *gougolōn*, MHG. *gougeln* 'gaukelpossen treiben,' OHG. *gougulāri*, MHG. *gougelære* 'zauberer, taschenspieler,' OHG. *gougarōn*, MHG. *gougern* 'umherschweifen': MHG. *gugen* 'schwanken,' *gogeln* 'sich ausgelassen geberden, hin u. her flattern.'

374. OHG. *gouh*, MHG. *gouch* 'kukuk, tor, narr,' MHG.

gouchen 'wie ein kukuk schreien, tor sein': *gucken*, OHG. *guccōn*, MHG. *gugzen*. Connected with preceding?

375. Goth. *gaumjan* 'wahrnehmen,' OHG. *bigoumen* 'acht geben,' *goumōn*, MHG. *goumen* 'schmausen, acht worauf geben,' OS. *gōmian* 'bewirten,' ON. *gaum*, OHG. *gouma* 'beachtung': ON. *guma* 'achten,' OE. *ofergumian* 'vernachlässigen.'

376. MHG. *beglūmen* 'trübe machen,' LG. *glūm* 'trübheit': *glummen* 'trübe machen,' *glum* 'trübe,' E. *glum*.

377. ON. *glȳs* 'flitter, tand,' *glȳra* 'glänzen, glitter': *glys* 'glimmer,' MHG. *glosen* 'glühen, glänzen,' MLG. *gluren* 'lauernd blicken, blinzeln.'

378. ON. *grūfa* 'sich niederbeugen,' *grȳfa* 'niederbeugen,' OE. *grēofa* 'kettle,' *grȳpe* 'trench, ditch,' OHG. *griobo*, *griupo* 'griebe, piece, particle': ON. *greyfa* 'niederbeugen,' *greypa* 'ineinander fügen, einzapfen,' *greypr*, *graupr* 'grimmig, grausam': MG. *grope*, *groppe* 'weiter eiserner topf,' ON. *gryfia* 'höhle, grube,' *grufla* 'krabbeln, kriechen,' OHG. *grubilōn* 'bohrend graben.'

379. OE. *grēosn* 'gravel, pebble': MHG. *grūs* 'grausen, schrecken,' OHG. *grūsōn*, MHG. *grūsen*, *griusen* 'grausen empfinden': OHG. *gruscrimmōn*, MHG. *grustgramen* 'vor unmut mit den zähnen knirschen.' Cf. OE. *gryre* 'horror, terror,' *gryrran* 'chatter of teeth,' *grornian* 'mourn, murmur,' *grorn* 'sad,' and *grisgramen*. Also OHG. *grūēn*, MHG. *grūen* 'grauen, grausen,' MHG. *grūwe*, *grūwel* 'grauen, schrecken,' *grien* 'grober sand.'

380. Goth. *hiuhma* 'haufen, menge': *hūhjan* 'aufhäufen, sammeln': *hauhs* 'hoch,' *hauhjan* 'erhöhen,' *ushauhnan* 'hoch werden,' OHG. *gi-hōhan*, MHG. *gehœhen* 'erhöhen,' OHG., MHG. *hōhen* 'hoch werden': NHG. *hügel*.

381. Goth. *hliuþ* 'gehör, aufmerksamkeit,' ON. *hliōþa* 'tönen, lauten': OHG. *lūtten*, MHG. *lūtten* 'läuten,' OHG. *hlūtēn*, MHG. *lūten* 'lauten, tönen,' *verlūtbœren* 'verlautbaren': OHG. *Hludwīg* 'Ludwig,' *Hlodhari* 'Lothar' (der ruhmvolle kämpfer). Cf. MHG. *verlūten*, *-liuten* 'nennen, verkündigen,' Goth. *hliuma* 'gehör.' Cf. the following.

381*a*. OHG. *lūstrēn*, MHG. *lūstern* 'lauschen, horchen': MHG. *lustern* 'horchen,' OE. *hlystan* 'aufhorchen,' *hlyst*, OS.

hlust 'gehör.' Cf. MHG. *lūschen* 'lauschen': OHG. *hlosēn*, *losōn*, MHG. *losen* 'zuhören, horchen,' *lusemen* 'horchen,' also OHG. *ga-un-hliumunteōn* 'infamare.'

382. ON. *hnūka* 'kauern,' *hnūkr*, *hniūkr* 'bergspitze': *hneykia* 'bezwingen, niederbrechen,' *hnauk* 'das drücken': MHG. *nucken*, *nücken* 'nicken, stutzen,' *entnücken* 'einnicken, einschlafen,' MLG. *nugen* 'beugen,' *nuck* 'plötzlicher stoss,' E. *nudge*.

383. OHG. *gihūfōn*, MHG. *hūfen* 'accumulare,' OHG. *hūfo* 'haufen,' MHG. *hiufeln*, *hūfeln* 'cumulare': OHG. *houfōn*, MHG. *houfen* 'häufen,' OHG., MHG. *houf* 'haufe.' Cf. OHG. *hiufila*, *hūfeli* 'wange, weibliche brust.'

384. Goth. *jiukan* 'kämpfen,' *jiuka* 'streit, kampf': MHG. *jöuchen*, *jouchen* 'jagen, treiben.' Cf. MHG. *jochen*.

385. OHG. *kliuwa*, *kliuwilīn* 'knäuel,' OE. *clewepa* 'itch': OE. *clāwan* 'claw,' OHG. *klāwen* 'prurire, scratch,' *klāwa* 'klaue,' MHG. *be-klœwen* 'mit klauen ergreifen.'

386. MHG. *klūter*, *kliuter* 'was sich ansetzt als zierat oder tand,' MLG. *klūte* 'klumpen, ball,' OE. *clūt* 'piece of cloth, patch, metal plate': OHG. *klōz* 'klumpige masse, kugel,' MHG. *klœzen* 'mit enem *klōz* spalten': *kloz* 'klotz,' E. *clot*.

387. MHG. *knouken* 'nicken': OE. *cnucel*, MHG. *knüchel* 'knöchel,' ON. *knoka*, OE. *cnucian* 'knock,' MHG. *knochen* 'knuffen,' *knoche* 'knochen,' *knoc* 'nacken,' *knocken* 'kauern, hocken,' E. *knuckle*.

388. ON. *kneyfa* 'drücken,' MHG. *knoufen* 'nodare,' *knouf*, 'knauf, knopf,' *knöufeln:* OHG. *pi-knuffan* 'anknüpfen,' MHG. *knüpfen*, *knupfen*, *knopfen*, *knopfeln* 'knüpfen,' *knüpfel*, *knübel* 'knöchel,' E. *knob*. Cf. *knouken*, etc., above.

389. MHG. *kniuren* 'prügeln, knuffen,' *erknüren* 'hart, zu stein werden,' OHG. *chniurig* 'knotig, derb,' MHG. *knüre* 'knoten, grober mensch': MHG. *knorzen* 'balgen, kneten,' *knorre*.

390. Goth. *kniu*, OHG. *kneo* 'knie,' *knewen*, MHG. *kniuwen* 'knien,' MHG. *kniewen*, *kniwen*, *knewen*, *knüen: knōwen*. The stem *knewa-* belongs in the fifth series as some of the forms show.

391. LG. *knūsen* 'drücken,' ON. *knūska* 'schlagen': ON. *knosa* 'schlagen,' Dan. *knuse* 'zermalmen, zerdrücken,' OHG. *knussen*, MHG. *knüssen*, *knüsen* 'stossen, schlagen, kneten,' *knüsten* 'stos-

sen, quetschen,' *knuspern* 'conquassare,' OE. *cnyssan* 'stossen, schlagen,' MHG. *zerknosten, knospe, knospel.*

392. ON. *knūtr* 'knoten,' *knūta* 'knöchel zum spielen,' *knȳta* 'knit, bind,' MHG. *knūz* 'keck, vermessen': OE. *cnēatian* 'dispute': MHG. *knüteln* 'mit knütteln schlagen,' OHG. *chnutil*, MHG. *knütel* 'knüttel,' MHG. *knutzen, knützen* 'drückend, quetschen,' *entknoten* 'den knoten lösen,' OHG. *knodo, knoto* 'knoten,' ON. *ū-knytter* 'schlechte streiche.' Cf. ON. *knūe* 'knöchel' and the foregoing stems in *kneu-, knū.*

393. MHG. *krūsen* 'kräuseln,' *kriuseln* 'zucken,' *krūs* 'kraus,' *kriusel* 'kraus': *gekræse* 'das kleine gedärme, gekröse,' OE. *crēasnes* 'pride,' E. *crease* 'falte, runzel, bruch,' *crease* 'falten, zerknittern, brechen': MLG. *krusemen* 'kraus machen; quetschen, zerdrücken.' Cf. Goth. *kriustan* st. v. 'knirschen,' OSw. *krȳsta* 'quetschen': Goth. *krusts* 'das knirschen,' MHG. *krollen, krüllen,* (*ll* = *zl*) 'kräuseln.' Cf. the following.

394. MHG. *krūspen* '*krūsp* machen,' *crūsp* 'kraus': MG. *krusp, kruspeleht* 'kraus.' Cf. *crispel, craspel, cruspeleht*, etc.

395. MHG. *kūchen* 'hauchen, keuchen': OE. *cohhettan* 'cough.'

396. OHG. *giliuban*, MHG. *gelieben* 'lieb u. angenehm machen,' OHG. *liubēn*, MHG. *lieben* 'gefallen,' Goth. *liufs* 'lieb': *ga-laubjan* 'glauben,' OHG. *gi-louben* 'glauben,' ON. *leyfa* 'loben, preisen,' MHG. *gelouben* 'glauben,' Goth. *galaufs* 'wertvoll': *lubains* 'hoffnung,' OHG. *lobōn, lobēn*, MHG. *loben* 'loben, preisen,' MHG. *geloben* 'versprechen,' *verlüben* 'sich durch gelübde verpflichten,' *lob* 'lob, preis.'

397. Goth. *liugan* 'heiraten,' *liuga* 'ehe,' OHG. *urliugi*, MHG. *urliuge* 'krieg,' MHG. *ur-liugen: ur-lougen* 'krieg führen,' *ur-louge* 'krieg' (cf. Uhlenbeck *liugan*).

398. OHG. *louga*, MHG. *louge* 'lauge,' ON. *laug* 'warmes bad,' *lauga* 'boden,' MHG. *löugen* 'wäsche laugen': cf. OHG. *luhhen* 'waschen.'

399. Goth. *in-liuhtjan* 'erleuchten,' OHG. *int-liuhten*, MHG. *entliuhten*, Goth. *liuhaþ* 'licht,' OHG. *liehtēn*, MHG. *liehten* 'leuchten': OHG. *lougazzan* 'feurig sein,' MHG. *lougen* 'flammen,' OHG. *loug, louc*, MHG. *louc* 'flamme': Goth. *laúhatjan*, OHG. *lohazzan, lohjan*, MHG. *lohen* 'flammen, lohe machen,' ON. *loge*,

MHG. *lohe* 'flamme.' Cf. OE. *lēoma*, OS. *liomo* 'strahl,' MHG. *ver-liehtern* 'zu lichtern machen.'

400. OHG. *mūhhan*, *mūhhōn*, MHG. *mūhhen* 'heimlich lauernd anfallen,' OHG. *mūhhilāri*, MHG. *miuchelære* 'meuchler,' OHG. *miuchelswert* 'dolch': MHG. *mocken* 'versteckt liegen,' *muckzen*, *muchzen*, OHG. *muckazzen* 'leise reden, mucken, mucksen,' NHG. *mucker* 'heimtücker.' Cf. NHG. Swiss *mauchen* 'heimlich naschen.'

401. OHG. *mūs* 'muskel (des oberarms); maus': OHG. *muscula*, MHG. *muschel* 'muschel,' *müsel* 'klotz,' *be-müseln* 'beflecken.'

402. Goth. *biniuhsjan* 'ausspähen,' OHG. *pi-niusan* 'erfahren, finden, erreichen': Goth. *binaúhan* 'erlaubt sein,' OHG. *ganuhtsamōn* 'in hinreichender fülle vorhanden sein,' *ginuht* 'genüge.' Cf. Goth. *ganah*, *ganōhjan*, OHG. *ginuogan*, etc. and Uhlenbeck *biniuhsjan*.

403. OHG. *riutan*, MHG. *riuten* 'reuten, ausreuten,' OHG. *riuti*, MHG. *riute*, 'gerodete stelle im walde': OMHG. *routen* 'ausreuten': ON. *ryðia* 'urbar machen,' OHG. *rod*, ON. *ruð* 'gerodete stelle.' Cf. ON. *rȳia* 'den schafen die wolle ausreissen.'

404. MHG. *riech* 'rauh, heiser': OHG. *rohōn*, MHG. *rohen* 'brüllen, grunzen,' OMHG. *ruhelōn*, MHG. *rühelen*, NHG. *röcheln*.

405. OE. *rēonian* 'flüstern,' MHG. *rienen* 'jammern, klagen, flehentlich bitten,' OE. *rēon* 'klage': Goth. *rūna*, ON. *rūn*, OE. *rūn* 'geheimnis,' OHG. *rūna*, MHG. *rūne* 'geheime beratung, geflüster, brummen, brüllen,' OHG. *rūnazzen*, MHG. *rūnzen* 'summen,' OHG. *rūnēn*, MHG. *rūnen*, OE. *rūnian* 'flüstern': ON. *raun* 'untersuchung': *grunr* 'verdacht,' *gruna* 'verdenken, bezweifeln.'

406. Goth. *raupjan*, OHG. *roufen*, MHG. *roufen* 'rupfen': MHG. *rupfen*, LG. *ruppen* intens., ME. *rippen*, E. *rip*. Cf. ON. *rjūfa* st. v. and OE. *rēofan*, No. 116.

407. MHG. *reupzen*, *roubsen* 'aufstossen, rülpsen': OHG. *roffazan*, *roffazōn*, MHG. *rofzen* 'rülpsen, aufstossen,' *roffezunge* 'das aufstossen.'

408. MHG. *riuspeln: rüspeln* 'räuspern.' Cf. MHG. *riuspern*, *rūspern* 'räuspern': *rospen* 'strepitare.'

409. MHG. *schiechen* 'scheuen,' *schiuhen*, *schiuwen* 'scheu machen': *schougen* 'scheuen, meiden.' Cf. OE. *scȳjan* 'suggest, persuade,' *scyhtan* 'instigate.'

410. OE. *scrūd* 'kleid': ON. *skriōðr* 'zerfetztes buch': OE. *scrēad* 'shred, paring,' OHG. *scrōtan* redup. 'hauen,' MHG. *verschrōten* 'zerhauen, abschneiden; wk. sich verhauen.'

411. OE. *scūdan* 'shake, tremble,' MHG. *schūdern* 'schaudern': MHG. *schüten* 'schwingen, schütteln,' OHG. *scutilōn*, MHG. *schütelen* 'schütteln,' *schutzen* 'durch schwung oder stoss in schnelle bewegung setzen.' Cf. OE. *scyndan*, ON. *skynda* 'eilen,' OHG. *scuntan*, MHG. *schünden* 'antreiben, reizen.'

412. OHG. *scūwo* 'schatten,' *scūjan*, *scūan* 'beschatten': Goth. *us-skawjan* 'besonnen, klug machen,' *usskaws* 'besonnen,' OE. *scēawian*, OHG. *scouwōn*, MHG. *schouwen* 'schauen': Goth. *skuggwa* 'spiegel,' ON. *skygna* 'spähen.' Cf. ON. *skiōne* 'apfelschimmel': OHG. *scōnjan*, *scōnnōn*, MHG. *schœnen* 'schön machen,' Goth. *skauns*, OHG. *scōni* 'schön.'

413. MHG. *slūchen* 'schlingen, schlucken,' *slūcher* 'schlemmer': *slucken*, *sluckzen* 'schlingen, schlucken, schluchzen.'

414. MHG. *slūdern* 'schleudern, schlenkern': *slotern* 'schlottern, zittern, klappern,' *slote* 'schlamm,' ON. *sloðra* 'sich hinschleppen.'

415. MHG. *smielen* 'lächeln': *smollen* 'schmollen.'

416. MHG. *sniuwen?* (pp. *entsniut*): *snouwen*, *snöuwen* 'schnauben, schnaufen.'

417. ON. *snȳta*, OE. *snȳtan*, OHG. *snūzen*, MHG. *sniuzen* 'schneuzen': *snuz* 'nasenverschleimung.'

418. OHG. *spriu* 'spreu': MHG. *sprœwen* 'spritzen, stieben,' OE. *sprēawlian* 'zucken,' E. *sprawl.*

419. Goth. *stiurjan*, ON. *stȳra*, OHG., MHG. *stiuren* 'feststellen, stützen, lenken,' OHG. *stūri*, *stiuri* 'stattlich, stark,' *stior* 'stier': ON. *staurr* 'pfahl.'

420. OHG. *stōrran*, MHG. *stœren* 'zerstreuen, zerstören': OE. *styrian* 'bewegen, stören,' E. *stir.*

421. MHG. *be-striuwen* 'bestreuen': *be-ströuwen*, Goth. *straujan* 'streuen,' OHG. *strawjan*, OHG. *strō* 'stroh,' MHG. *strōu* 'streu.'

422. OHG. *strūbēn*, MHG. *strūben* 'struppig sein,' *striubeln*: OHG. *stropolōn*, MHG. *strobeln* 'struppig sein, machen,' *strobel* 'struppig.'

423. MHG. *strūmen* 'strömen,' *strūm* 'strom': ON. *straumr*, OHG., MHG. *stroum* 'strom.'

424. OE. *strūtian* 'stand out stiffly, be rigid,' MHG. *strūz* 'strauss, strauch; widerstand, streit,' ON. *strūtr*, *strȳta* 'projection, peak': MHG. *striuzen* 'spreizen, sträuben': MHG. *strozzen* 'strotzen,' *strotzen* 'aufwallen,' *strozze* 'luftröhre,' Dan. *strutte* 'starren, strotzen.'

425. OHG. *stūda* 'staude, strauch': *studen* 'feststellen,' MHG. *stüden* 'feststellung, gesetz,' *studelen* 'festhalten, nehmen,' *stud* 'stütze, pfosten, säule,' OE. *studu*, *stupu* 'pillar, post,' ON. *stoð* 'stütze,' *styðia* 'stützen.'

426. OHG. *stūan*, *stūen*: *stowan*, *stouwen*, MHG. *stouwen*, *stöuwen* 'einhalt tun, gebieten; hemmen, stauen; schelten, klagen.' Cf. OE. *stōwian* 'hemmen,' Goth. *stiwiti* 'geduld,' i. e. 'festigkeit.' (Cf. Wood, *IE.* a^x:a^xi:a^xu 129.)

427. OHG. *sūl*, ON. *sūla* 'säule': Goth. *sáuls* 'säule': *gasuljan* 'gründen,' OHG. *sola*, MHG. *sole* 'sohle.' Cf. MHG. *swelle*, OHG. *swelli* 'schwelle.'

428. Goth. *bisáuljan* 'beflecken,' *bi-sáulnan* 'sich verunreinigen': OHG. *bi-suljan*, MHG. *besuln* 'besudeln,' OHG. *solōn*, MHG. *solen* 'besudelt werden,' OE. *sylian* 'make muddy,' OHG. *solagōn*, MHG. *solgen*, *soligen* 'sich im kote wälzen.'

429. OHG. *ge-ziugōn* 'declarare, bezeugen,' MHG. *ziugen* 'erzeugen, anschaffen,' OHG. *giziug* 'ausrüstung, gerät,' MHG. *ziuc* 'handwerkzeug,' *ziuge* 'zeuge': OHG. *zougan*, MHG. *zöugen* 'zeigen, beweisen': OHG. *zogōn*, MHG. *zogen* 'ziehen, eilen,' MHG. *zoc* 'zug,' *zogen* 'sich auf den weg machen,' *zogeren* the same. Cf. No. 139.

430. MHG. *diumeln*, *diumen* 'foltern, die daumenschraube anlegen,' OHG. *dūmo*, MHG. *dūme* 'daumen': ON. *þumall*, E. *thumb*.

431. MHG. *diusen* 'zerren, zausen': ON. *þiōstr* 'violence': OHG. *dōsōn* 'brausen, tosen,' MHG. *dōsen*, OHG. *dōsen*, MHG. *dœsen* 'zerstören,' ON. *þausn* 'tumult,' *þeysa* 'let run, drive': ON. *þysia* 'rush forth,' *þys* 'storm, tumult.'

432. OHG. *douwen, dawen*, MHG. *douwen* 'aufgelöst werden': MDu. *verduwen.*

433. ON. *prauka* 'sich anstrengen': OHG. *drucchen*, MHG. *drücken* 'drücken, bedrängen,' OE. *pryccan* 'press, trample.' Cf. ON. *prūga* 'drücken,' OHG. *drūh* 'fessel,' MHG. *driuhen* 'fangen, fesseln.'

CLASS III

434. MHG. Swiss *bangen, banken* 'stossen,' *bangeln, bankeln* 'schaukeln,' MHG. *bengel* 'prügel,' *bengeln* 'prügeln,' E. *bang:* MHG. *bungen* 'trommeln, pauken,' *bunge* 'trommel,' MHG. Swiss *bungen, büngen*, iter. *bungeln.* Cf. MHG. *pinken* No. 467.

435. Goth. *ga-blindjan* 'verblenden,' *gablindnan* 'blind werden,' ON. *blinda* 'blenden,' Goth. *blinds*, ON. *blindr*, OHG. *blint*, OHG. *blintēn*, MHG. *blinden* 'blind werden': Goth. *blandan*, ON. *blanda*, OHG. *blantan* st. redup. 'mischen,' OHG. *blenden*, MHG. *blenden* 'blind machen': ON. *blunda* 'dormire,' *blundr* 'sopor.'

436. LMHG., NHG. *blinken* 'funkeln, glitter,' *blinkern, blink und blank* 'shining,' MHG. *blinzen, blinzeln:* MHG. *blanken* 'blank sein,' *blenken* 'unstät herumfahren, blank machen,' *blenkezen* intens., OHG., MHG. *blanc* 'blinkend weiss, schön.' Cf. NDu. *blinken* st. v. Cf. *blicken* also.

437. MHG. *brangen, prangen* 'prangen, prahlen,' *branc, pranc* 'das prangen, prunken, prahlen': *brunken* 'zeigen, zur schau stellen.'

438. NHG. *dilläzeln* 'zwecklos tändeln,' OHG. *tallazjan*, MHG. *telzen* 'streicheln, klopfen': OHG. *tollōn* 'streicheln.'

439. MHG. *tamer* 'schall durch klopfen,' *temeren* 'schlagen, klopfen': *tummern* 'klopfen, schlagen,' *getummer.*

440. MHG. *timpen: tampen* hunter's term, meaning not clear, but evidently analogous ablaut.

441. ON. *døkkr:* E. *dank* 'dumpfig, feucht': OHG. *tunchelen*, MHG. *tunkeln* 'trübe machen,' OHG. *tunchelēn* MHG. *tunchelen* 'trübe werden.'

442. MHG. *velden* 'zu felde sein,' OHG. *feld:* ON. *fold* 'grasfeld,' OE. *folda* 'erde, erdboden.'

443. Goth., OHG. *filu* 'viel': Goth. *fulljan*, OHG. *fullen*, MHG. *vüllen* 'füllen,' OHG. *follōn* 'ausfüllen, voll machen.'

444. OHG. *firnēn*, MHG. *virnen* 'alt werden,' *firni*, Goth. *fairneis* 'alt,' MHG. *vernen* 'ferne sein': ON. *forn* 'alt,' MHG. *vorn* 'früher.' Cf. OHG. *ferrēn*, MHG. *verren* 'fern sein,' OHG. *fir-firren*, MHG. *vervirren* 'entfernen.'

445. MLG. *vinkelen* 'funkeln': MHG. *vanken* 'leuchten,' *venken* 'entzünden,' *vanke* 'funke': *vunken* 'funkeln,' *vunkeln*, OHG. *funcho*, MHG. *funke*. Cf. MHG. *vengen* 'zünden.'

446. Early NHG. *flimmen*, *flimmern* 'flammen': MHG. *flammen*, *vlammern*.

447. MHG. *vlinsen* 'zittern, schimmern,' *vlins* 'schimmern': OSw. *flunsa* 'plunge,' Norw. *flunsa* 'hurry,' E. *flounce* 'move with flings or turns,' MHG. *flunst* 'zitterndes fliessen.' Cf. MHG. *vlenseln* 'streicheln?,' *vlansen* 'adulari, fawn, flatter,' *vlans* 'mund, maul.'

448. MHG. *gargeln*, E. *gargle* 'gurgeln': MHG. *gurgeln*, NHG. *gurgeln* 'gurgeln,' OHG. *gurgula*, MHG. *gurgel*.

449. MHG. *gimpel-gempel* 'mutwilliger hüpfer, springer, penis': *gampen* 'hüpfen, springen,' *gampf* 'schwanken,' *gampel* 'scherz,' *gampieren*, *gampenieren* 'hüpfen, springen, tänzeln,' *gampeln* 'das springen': *gumpen*, *gumpern* 'hüpfen, springen,' *gumpeln* 'possen reissen,' *gumpel* 'springen, scherz,' *gümpel* 'penis.'

450. MHG. *glanken* 'sich schlingen': *glunkern* 'baumeln, bummeln,' *glunke* 'gedrehte locke.' Cf. MHG. *klunke*.

451. MG. *glinstern* 'glänzen, funkeln,' *glinsten* 'glänzen,' MHG. *glinster* 'glanz': MG. *glanstern* 'glänzen,' MHG. *glanster* 'funke,' *glanst* 'glanz': *glunstern* 'funkeln.' Cf. MHG. *glinsen*, *glünsen* 'glimmen,' *glunse* 'funkenasche,' also MHG. *glimmen* st. v.

452. OHG. *haldēn* 'abhängig sein, sich neigen,' *heldan*, MHG. *helden* 'neigen,' OHG. *halda*, MHG. *halde* 'abhang': OHG. *huldan*, MHG. *hulden* 'geneigt machen,' MHG. *huldigen* 'freundlich, treu machen,' OHG. *huldī*, MHG. *hulde* 'huld, wohlwollen,' OHG. *holdo*, MHG. *holde* 'freund, geliebter,' Goth. *hulþs*, OHG. *hold*, MHG. *holt* 'geneigt, günstig, gnädig.'

453. MHG. *hargen* 'stutzig sein, sich wälzen, bocken?,' Bav. dial. *hargeln: horgeln, hurgeln* 'rollen.' Cf. Bav. *härg* 'scharf, zornig.'

454. ON. *há*(=**hanhōn*) 'plagen, quälen': Goth. *huggrjan*, OHG. *hungiren, hungerōn*, MHG. *hungern* 'hungern,' Goth. *hūhrus*, OHG. *hungar*, MHG. *hunger.*

455. OE. *hlinc*, E. *linch* 'aufgeworfener grabhügel,' ON. *hlekkr*, E. *link:* OE. *hlanc*, E. *lank* 'dünn, mager,' OHG. *lanca, hlanca* 'hüfte, lende,' MHG. *gelanc*, 'taille,' NHG. *gelenk;* MHG. *lenken* 'biegen, falten, wenden,' *verlankenieren* 'die seiten des rosses mit decken behängen.' Cf. MHG. *linc* 'schräge,' NHG. *lenken.*

456. OHG. *kirnan*, MHG. *kirnen, kernen* 'dreschen,' OHG. *kerno*, MHG. *kerne* 'kern': MHG. *körnen* 'mit körnern locken,' *erkürnen* 'erforschen,' OHG., MHG. *korn* 'korn.'

457. OHG. *chindōn*, MHG. *kinden, kindeln* 'kinder erzeugen oder gebären,' MHG. *ver-kindischen* 'kindisch werden': ON. *kundr* 'sohn': Goth. *kunds* in *himinakunds* 'himmlisch.'

458. NHG. *klimpern* (new onomat.): MHG. *klumpern* 'klang mit musikalischen instrumenten machen.'

459. MHG. *klinke* 'türklinke,' MDu. *klinken* 'mit klinke versehen,' Scotch *clink* 'clench, weld; clasp, clutch': OHG. *klenkan*, MHG. *klenken* 'binden, schlingen,' *klanc* 'schlinge; list, ränke,' OE. *be-clencan*, E. *clench* 'die faust ballen; umfassen, packen; befestigen': *klunke* 'gedrehte locke.' Cf. OE. *clingan* st. v. 'sich zusammenziehen,' etc. Cf. Du. *klinken* st. 'clinch, rivet,' and No. 450.

460. MHG. *lerken, lirken* 'stottern,' *lerc, lirc* 'link, lahm': E. *lark* 'lustige streiche machen, in toller weise springen oder klettern': MHG. *lurken* 'stottern,' *lurc* 'link, lahm,' LG. *lork* 'frosch.'

461. MHG. *lerzen* 'stammeln, übermütig sein,' *lerz* 'link': *lürzen, lurzen* 'täuschen, betrügen,' *lurz* 'link,' OE. *belyrtan* 'deceive, cheat.'

462. OHG., MHG. *melm* 'staub': Goth. *malma* 'sand,' NHG. *zermalmen:* MHG. *zermülmen* 'zerreiben, zerquetschen.'

463. OHG. *melo*, MHG. *mel* 'mehl,' MHG. *milwen* 'zu *mel*

oder staub machen': Goth. *ga-malwjan* 'zermalmen,' ON. *mǫlua, mølua* 'zermalmen.' Cf. the above and Goth. *mulda* 'staub,' OHG. *molta* 'staub, erde.'

464. OHG. *maro, marawi* 'mürbe,' MHG. *mar, merwen* 'weich machen': OHG. *muruwi* 'mürbe,' MHG. *mürwe, mür*, OHG. *muruwī* 'mürbheit,' NHG. *mürben* 'mürbe sein, werden.'

465. Goth. *gaminþi* 'andenken': OHG. *mendan*, OS. *mendian*, MHG. *menden* 'sich freuen,' OHG. *mandilōn* 'be glad, sich freuen,' OHG. *mandunga*, MHG. *mandunge* 'freude,' OHG. *mendī*, MHG. *mende* 'freude': Goth. *mundōn* 'auf etwas sehen,' OHG. *armuntran*, MHG. *ermuntern;* OHG. *muntar*, MHG. *munter* 'frisch, lebhaft,' OHG. *muntari* 'eifer.'

466. ON. *nist* 'heftnadel am kleide, pin,' *nista* 'zusammen hefften': OHG. *nestila* 'binde, bandschleife,' MHG. *nesteln* 'festbinden, schnüren': OHG. *nusta* 'verknüpfung.' Cf. OHG. *nuscja*, MHG. *nusche* 'gürtelschnalle.'

467. MHG. *pinken* 'winken, auf- und zuschlagen der augen,' *pinken* in the dialects is onomat. and means 'schlagen, hämmern, jammern': *Pinkenpank* name, cf. Lexer *MHG. Dict.: punken* 'stossen, schlagen,' *punkeln* 'pochen,' *punkelīn* 'schlag, stoss.' (Cf. No. 434 above.)

468. OHG. *querdar*, MHG. *querder, kerder* 'lockspeise,' MHG. *kerdern* 'speisen': OHG. *chorder*, MHG. *korder* 'lockspeise.'

469. Goth. *asiluqaírnus* 'mühlstein,' OHG. *quirnstein, quirn*, ON. *kuern* 'mühlstein': MHG. *kürnen* 'malen, zermalmen,' OHG. *churn*, MHG. *kurnestein* 'mühlstein.'

470. MHG. *ranken* 'wie ein esel schreien': prob. from *runchen* 'murmurare' from M. Lat. *runcare* 'schnarchen, schnauben,' LG. *ronken* 'schnarchen.'

471. MHG. *rinsen, rinsern* (new): *rensen, ransen, rensern, ransern*, 'die glieder dehnen, recken.'

472. MHG. *schalpern* 'stagnare': *schulpern.*

473. OHG. *scirbinōn*, MHG. *schirben* 'in stücke brechen,' OHG. *scirbi*, MHG. *scherbe* 'scherbe': *scarbōn*, MHG. *scharben* 'zerschneiden, schaben.' Cf. OHG. *screvōn* 'einschneiden,' *scurfen* 'aufschneiden.'

474. MHG. *scherzen* 'scherzen': *scharz* 'sprung.' Cf. OHG. *skern*, MHG. *schern*, 'scherz, spott,' OHG. *scerōn* 'mutwillig sein.'

475. OHG. *scimphan*, MHG. *schimpfen* 'scherzen, spielen,' MHG. *schimphieren* 'verspotten, schimpf': *schampf* 'scherz': *schumpfe* 'buhlerin.'

476. MHG. *schimpfentiure* from: *schumpfentiuren*, *schumpfieren* 'siegen, besiegen,' *schumpfentiure* 'besiegung' from French 'desconfiture.' Cf. Lexer.

477. OHG. *snellēn* 'vigere,' OHG., MHG. *snel* 'schnell, kräftig': MHG. *snallen*, *snellen* 'schnelle bewegung machen,' *snal* 'schnelle bewegung.'

478. MHG. *snarchen*, *snarcheln*, 'schnarchen,' Du. *snarken*. MHG. *snorchen*, Du. *snorken*, *snurken* 'schnarchen, schwatzen.'

479. MHG. *snarren* 'schnarren,' *gesnerre* 'das schnarren': *snurren*, Du. *snorren* 'rauschen, sausen.' Cf. MHG. *snar* 'schnarren,' *snur* 'sausendes fahren.'

480. OHG. *bi-spennan* 'ablactare,' MHG. *spen* 'brust, milch,' *spenen* 'abwendig machen': OHG. *spunne*, MHG. *spünne* 'mutterbrust,' *spünnen* 'säugen.'

481. OHG. *stilli* 'still,' *stillēn*, 'ruhig werden,' *stillan* 'still machen': *stellen* 'stellen': *stulla* 'zeitpunkt,' *stullan* 'halt machen,' *stollo*, MHG. *stolle* 'stütze, pfosten,' OHG. *stollōn*, MHG. *stollen* 'gründen.' Cf. Goth. *ga-staldan* redup. 'erwerben,' *stōls* 'stuhl,' MHG. *stüelen*, *stuolen* 'sitze bereiten.'

482. OHG. *stelza* (e or ë), MHG. *stelze* 'holzbein,' *stelzen* 'auf stelzen gehen': *stolzen*, *stülzen* 'hinken, stelzen.'

483. OHG. *stamph* 'stämpfel; klotz,' *stamfōn*, MHG. *stamphen* 'stampfen,' *stempfeln*, *stempfen* 'befestigen, stampfen': OHG. *stumph*, MHG. *stumpf*, OHG. *stumphan*, MHG. *stumpfen* 'verstümmeln.' Cf. OHG. *pistumpalōn*, MHG. *bestümbeln* 'verstümmeln,' OHG. *stumbal* 'stummel.'

484. MHG. *strinze: strenze* 'equa,' *stranzen*, *strenzen* 'müssig umherlaufen, gross tun.'

485. OHG. *giswarzōn*, *swarzēn*, MHG. *swarzen* 'schwarz werden,' OHG., MHG. *swarz* 'schwarz': ON. *sorta* 'schwarze farbe,' *sorte* 'schwarze wolke.'

486. MHG. *zirben* 'wirbeln, im kreise herumdrehen': OHG. *zerben* 'sich drehen,' OE. *tearfljan* 'sich drehen.'

487. MHG. *zerten* 'zärtlich sein, liebkosen,' *zart* 'lieb, vertraut': *zurten-zerteln?* (ir zurtenzertelt nicht der munt ieslîchem ze blicke).

488. Goth. *ga-tarhjan* 'auszeichnen': OHG. *zorhtôn* 'hell machen,' *zoraht*, OE. *torht* 'hell, klar.' Cf. MHG. *zorften* 'hell machen,' OHG. *zorft*.

489. MHG. *zenden* 'mit zähnen versehen,' OHG. *zan*, *zand*, MHG. *zan*, *zant* 'zahn': Goth. *tunþus* 'zahn.' Cf. OHG. *zanôn*, *zanigôn*, MHG. *zanen* 'mit zähnen packen,' MHG. *anzannen* 'anfletschen.' OHG. *zinna*, MHG. *zinne* 'zinne,' MHG. *zint* 'zacke' here?

490. MHG. *trindeln: trendeln* 'sich drehen, wirbeln,' *trendel*, OE. *trendel* 'roll, roller-wheel': OE. *tryndel* 'roll, roller, wheel,' E. *trundle* 'roll, revolve; a wheel.' Cf. OHG. *trennilôn* 'sich drehen, wirbeln,' *trennila* 'kreisel, kugel.'

491. Goth. *þairh* 'durch,' OHG. *derh* 'durchlöchert': MHG. *dürkeln*, *dürchen* 'durchlöchern,' OHG. *durchil*, MHG. *dürkel* 'durchlöchert, durchbohrt.'

492. Goth. *þagkjan*, OHG. *denchan* 'denken, überlegen,' OHG. *danchôn*, MHG. *danken* 'danken,' MHG. *danc* 'dank, gedanke': Goth. *þugkjan*, OHG. *dunchen*, MHG. *dunken* 'dünken, scheinen,' MHG. *dunk* 'bedünken,' OE. *þyncan* 'dünken,' E. *think*.

493. MHG. *walkieren* 'dicht machen,' OHG. *walkan*, MHG. *walken* redup. 'walken, sich rollen': OHG. *wulkjan* in pp. 'pressed together.'

494. OHG. *wilchen* 'weich machen,' *welkên*, MHG. *welken* 'welken, schlaff sein,' *welc* 'feucht, milde, lau, welk': OHG. *wolchenôn* 'wolkig werden,' MHG. *be-wülken* 'bewölken.'

495. OHG. *wirkan*, MHG. *wirken* 'wirken,' OHG. *werkôn*, MHG. *werken* 'arbeiten, wirken,' OHG. *werah*, MHG. *werc* 'arbeit, werk': OS. pret. *warhta:* Got. *waûrkjan*, OHG. *wurchen*, MHG. *würken*, Got. *frawaûrhts*, OHG. *farworaht* 'sündhaft.'

496. MHG. *wirz*, MG. *werz* 'würze': OHG. *warza*, MHG. *warze* 'warze': OHG. *wurzôn*, MHG. *wurzen* 'wurzeln,' OHG. *wurzellôn*, MHG. *wurzelen* 'wurzeln,' MHG. *würzen* 'würzen,'

Goth. *waúrts* 'wurzel,' OHG. *wurz* 'kraut, pflanze,' *wurzala*, MHG. *wurzel* 'wurzel.'

497. MHG. *wimmerzen: wammerzen* 'wimmern.' Cf. MHG. *wimmen*, *wimeln* 'sich regen, wimmeln,' *wimmer*, *gewammer* 'gewinsel.'

498. OE. *wrencan* 'twist, turn,' OHG. *bi-renkan* 'verrenken,' MHG. *renken* 'drehend ziehen,' *ranken* 'dehnen, strecken, hin u. her bewegen,' OHG. *rank*, MHG. *ranc* 'verdreht': MHG. *runken* 'runzeln,' *runke* 'runzel': OE. *wrinclian* 'wrinkle.' Cf. MHG. *rinzlen: runzeln* 'runzeln,' *runze* 'runzel,' *ranzen* 'ungestüm hin und her springen,' *renzeln* freq. hin u. her schwingen. Cf. *wringan* st. v.

CLASS IV

499. MHG. *bretern* 'aus brettern machen,' OHG., MHG. *bret* 'brett': MHG. *bort* 'brett,' Goth. *fōtubaúrd* 'fussbank.'

500. MHG. *bragen: brogen* 'sich erheben, gross tun.' Cf. MHG. *bruht* 'widerstand.'

501. E. *brim* 'rand,' MHG. *bremen* 'verbrämen,' *brem* 'rand': ENHG. *brame* 'rand.'

502. MHG. *gephnœte* 'schnauben': *phnutten* 'ausschnauben.'

502*a*. OHG. *fnāhten* p. praes. 'schnaubend': MHG. *phnuht* 'keuchen, schnauben.'

503. ON. *fnasa:* MHG. *phnāsen* 'schnauben.' Cf. MHG. *phnesten:* OHG. *fnāstōn* 'schnauben,' MHG. *phnāst* 'schnauben.'

504. OHG. *fremman*, MHG. *fremen* 'vorwärts schaffen, ausführen,' Goth., OHG. *fram* 'fort, vorwärts': OHG. *frumman*, MHG. *vrumen* 'vorwärts bringen,' *vrümen* 'vorwärts schaffen,' OHG. *fruma* 'nutzen,' MHG. *frum* 'tüchtig, brav, nützlich.'

505. Goth. *himins* 'himmel,' OHG. *himil:* Goth. *afhamōn* 'die kleidung ablegen,' OHG. *hamo* 'hülle, kleid,' *hemidi* 'hemd,' MHG. *hamen* 'hindern,' *ham* 'hülle, kleid': OHG. *humil* 'himmel.'

506. Goth. *inu* 'ohne': OHG. *āna*, *āno* 'ohne,' MHG. *ānen* 'berauben;' intr. 'ledig, beraubt sein': Goth., OHG., etc. *un-* neg. pref.

507. ON. *skilja* 'teilen, scheiden,' Goth. *skilja* 'fleischer': OHG. *skelen*, MHG. *scheln* 'schälen,' Goth. *skalja* 'ziegel,' OHG. *scala*, MHG. *schale* 'schale, hülse': ON. *skāl* 'schale,' OHG.

scāla 'schale': MHG. *schollen* 'anhäufen?,' *erschüllen* 'höckerig machen,' OHG. *scolla*, MHG. *scholle* 'scholle.' Cf. Goth. *skildus*, OHG. *scilt*, MHG. *schilt* 'schild,' MHG. *schilten* 'schützen.'

508. MHG. *schramen* 'aufreissen, öffnen,' *schram* 'schramme, schwertwunde; loch': *schrœmen* 'schräge machen, biegen,' ON. *skrœma* 'schrecken, verscheuchen,' *skrāma* 'wunde.' Cf. MHG. *schrimpfen* st. v. 'sich zusammenziehen,' *schrimpf* 'kleine wunde.'

509. OHG. *smero*, MHG. *smer* 'fett, schmeer,' *smirwen*, MHG. *smirwen* 'mästen, fett machen, schmieren,' OHG. *smerwēn* 'fettartig werden': OHG. *bīsmarōn* 'verspotten': ON. *smyrja* 'ungere,' MHG. *smurben* 'schmieren, salben.' *Smurben* from *smirben*. Cf. Goth. *smaírþr* 'fett,' *smarna* 'mist, kot.'

510. MHG. *sneren* 'schwatzen, plappern': *gesnœren* 'schwatzen, plappern,' *gesnœre* 'geschwätz.' Cf. *snarren* No. 479.

511. OHG. *starēn*, MHG. *staren* 'starren, stieren,' OHG. *star* 'starr,' ON. *stara* 'starren': OHG. *storrēn* 'hervorstehen, ragen,' MHG. *storren* 'starr sein, werden,' Goth. *andstaúrran* 'unwillig anstarren,' OHG. *stornēn* 'bestürzt machen,' MHG. *storzen* intens. of *storren*. OHG. *storrēn* and the following belong properly to the third class.

512. MHG. *streben* 'sich heftig bewegen, ringen': *straf* 'straff, strenge,' MHG. *strabeln* 'zappeln, ringen.'

513. OHG. *strickan* 'heften, schnüren, flechten,' MHG. *stricken* 'zusammenfügen,' OHG. *stric* 'strick': *strecken* 'strecken, ausdehnen,' *strackēn* 'ausgedehnt sein,' MHG. *strac* 'grade, straff,' OE. *streccan* 'stretch out, extend, spread out,' MLG. *straken* 'überstreichen.' Cf. OHG. *starc* 'kräftig, stark,' Goth. *ga-staúrknan* 'erstarren.'

514. MHG. *tratzen*, *tretzen* 'trotzen,' *traz* 'trotz': *trutzen* 'reizen, necken,' *truz*, *trotz* 'trotz.'

515. Goth. *uf-þanjan* 'ausdehnen,' OHG. *dennan*, MHG. *dennen* 'ausstrecken, spannen': OHG. *donēn* 'sich spannen,' MHG. *donen* 'sich ausdehnen,' OHG. *dunni* 'dünn,' OHG. *dunnēn*, MHG. *dunnen* 'dünn werden.' Cf. Goth. *atþinsan* st. 'herziehen,' OE. *þindan* 'swell, be angry.'

516. OHG. *dremil*, MHG. *dremel* 'balken, riegel': MHG. *drāmen* 'mit balken versehen, stützen,' MHG. *drām* 'balke, riegel,

splitter, stück': OHG. *drumōn*, MHG. *drumen* 'abschneiden, zerbrechen,' OHG., MHG. *drum* 'stück, splitter.'

517. Goth. *wiljan* 'wünschen, verlangen, wollen,' OHG. *wellan*, MHG. *wellen* 'wollen,' OHG. *willōn*, MHG. *willen* 'willig sein,' OHG. *willigōn*, MHG. *willigen* 'willig machen': Goth. *waljan*, OHG. *wellan*, MHG. *wellen* 'wählen,' Goth. *walisa* 'geliebt,' OHG. *wala* 'auswahl': OHG. pret. *wolta*, MHG. *wolte* 'wollte.'

CLASS V

518. MHG. *blicze*, *blitze* 'blitz,' *bliczen* intens. of *blicken* 'blicken, schauen, glänzen, blitzen': OHG. *blechen*, MHG. *blecken* 'blitzen, sichtbar werden,' ON. *blaka* 'shake,' MHG. *bleczen* intens. 'blitzen,' M. Du. *blaken* 'flattern.'

519. MHG. *vesel*, *visel* 'penis,' *viselen* 'knabbern': *veseln* 'pflegen, unterhalten,' *vaseln* 'gedeihen, fruchten,' *vasel* 'zuchtstier, eber; das junge.'

520. OHG. *fledarōn*, MHG. *vledern* 'flattern': ON. *flaðra* 'wag,' NHG. *fladdern*, *flattern*. Cf. E. *flitter*, *flatter*, *flutter* with different consonant but probably felt as belonging together. Cf. OHG. *flitarazjan* 'schmeichelnd liebkosen,' MHG. *vlittern* 'leise lachen, kichern,' MHG. *vlatertasche* 'plaudertasche.'

521. OHG. *klaphōn* 'klappen, krachen,' MHG. *klapfen*, *klaffen* 'schallen, tönen': OHG. *klopfōn*, MHG. *klopfen* 'klopfen, pochen,' MHG. *klopfel*, *klüpfel* 'knüppel.' Cf. MHG. *klappern* onomat., also *klupfen* 'erschrecken,' *klupf* 'schreck.'

522. MHG. *kletten*, *klettern* 'klettern,' *klate* 'kralle,' OHG. *kletta*, MHG. *klette* 'klette,' ON. *klettr* 'klippe': ON. *klōt* 'schwertknauf.'

523. OHG. *chrachōn* 'krachen,' *chrac* 'riss, sprung; geräusch, krach,' OMHG. *chraken* 'kratzen, kratzend klauben,' NHG. *krächzen* 'croak,' OE. *cracian* 'crack, crash': ON. *krākr* 'rabe,' *krāka* 'krähe': OHG. *croccezen*, MHG. *krochzen*, *krotzen* 'krächzen, krähen.' Cf. MHG. *kragen* 'kratzen, ritzen,' *krage* 'haue, hacke.'

524. ON. *kuistr* 'twig, branch': MHG. *quast* 'laubbüschel,' *questen* 'mit dem badwedel streichen.' OHG. *quëst*a or *questa?*

525. MHG. *liberen : leben* 'gerinnen,' OHG. *lab* 'brühe,'

MHG. *lab* 'coagulum': *lob* 'lab,' Goth. *lubja* 'gift,' ON. *lyf* 'arznei.' Cf. MHG. *kæselap, kæseluppe*, OHG. *kāsiluppa* 'käseluppe.' The *a* : *u* ablaut is irregular; cf. OE. *nasu, nosu.*

526. OHG. *masala* 'blutiger auswuchs,' MHG. *masel* 'auswuchs,' OE. *maser* 'knoten im holz,' OHG. *masar*, MHG. *maser* 'knorriger auswuchs': OHG. *māsa*, MHG. *māse* 'wundmal, narbe,' MHG. *māsen* 'verwunden, mit *māsen* versehen,' *māsegen* 'beflecken.'

527. ON. *rasa* 'einherstürzen': MHG. *rāsen* 'toben, rasen,' ON. *rās* 'lauf.' Cf. OHG. *rasc* 'schnell, hurtig,' ON. *rǫskr* 'bold.'

528. OHG. *sega*, MHG. *sege* 'säge': OHG. *saga*, MHG. *sage* 'säge,' OHG. *sagōn, segōn*, MHG. *segen, sagen* 'sägen.' Cf. OHG. *seh* 'pflugmesser,' *sahs* 'schwert.'

529. Goth. *samjan* 'gefallen,' ON. *sama* 'passen, befit,' OHG. *samanōn*, MHG. *samelen* 'sammeln,' OHG. *gisemōn* 'sich versammeln,' Goth. OHG. *sama* 'derselbe': ON. *sōma* 'passen, befit.'

529*a*. Goth. *saþs* 'satt,' OHG. *satōn*, MHG. *saten* 'sättigen': Goth. *ga-sōþjan* 'sättigen.'

530. Goth. *skaþjan*, OHG. *scadōn*, MHG. *schaden* 'schaden,' Goth. *skaþis* 'schaden': ON. *skǫðr* 'schädlich' *skōð* 'ungemach.'

531. MHG. *slemen* 'umkehren, stürzen,' ON. *slamra* 'beat,' E. *slam* : ON. *slǫma* 'swing, brandish.'

532. OHG. *ir-spehōn*, MHG. *erspehen* 'erforschen, spähen': OHG. *spāhi* 'klug, weise,' MHG. *spœhen* 'klug machen.'

533. Goth. *swiglōn*, OMHG. *sweglōn*, MHG. *swegelen* 'pfeifen, flöten': Goth. *swēgnjan* 'frohlocken,' *swēgniþa* 'freude': *gaswōgjan, swōgatjan* 'seufzen.'

534. OHG. *swigur*, MHG. *swiger* 'schwiegermutter,' Goth. *swaíhra*, OHG. *swehur*, MHG. *sweher* : *swaher* 'schwiegervater': *swāgern* 'einen als schwager anreden,' *swāger* 'schwager.'

535. MHG. *zic* 'leise berührung, leichter stoss,' *zicken* 'stossen, necken,' E. *tickle* 'kitzeln': MHG. *zec*, NHG. *zeck* same as E. *tag*, MLG. *tacken* 'berühren, betasten,' ON. *taka* st. v. 'nehmen': Goth. *tēkan* redup. 'berühren.'

536. MHG. *zipf, zipfel* 'zipfel,' *zipfeln* 'mit zipfeln versehen': OHG. *zapfo* 'zapfen,' MHG. *zapfe*, MHG. *zapfen, zepfen* 'mit zapfen versehen.'

CLASS VI

537. Goth. *aba* 'ehemann,' *abrs* 'stark, heftig,' OE. *abal*, ON. *afl* 'stärke, kraft,' OHG. *avalōn* 'sich rühren': *uobo* 'landbauer,' *uoba* pl. 'treiben, landbau,' *uoban*, MHG. *üeben* 'ausüben.'

538. Goth. *af-agjan* 'abschrecken, ängstigen,' *agis* 'angst, schrecken,' OHG. *akī*, MHG. *ege* 'schrecken,' OHG. *egōn* 'schrecken': Goth. *ōg* pret. pres. 'fürchte' (**agan* st. v. cf. part. pres. *unagands* 'furchtlos'), *ōgjan* 'in furcht setzen.' Cf. Goth. *usagljan* 'belästigen,' *aglus* 'beschwerlich,' OHG. *agisōn*, MHG. *eisen* 'erschrecken.'

539. MHG. *asten* 'colere, äste gewinnen': OE. *ōst*, MLG. *ōst* 'ast, knorren, knoten.'

540. OHG. *adal*, MHG. *adel* 'edles geschlecht,' MHG. *unedelen* 'unedel werden': OHG. *uodal*, *uodil* 'erbsitz.'

541. ME. *babe*, E. *baby;* OHG. *babo* proper noun : MHG. *buobe* 'knabe, diener,' OHG. *buobo* proper noun, MHG. *buobelieren* 'in büberei leben.'

542. MHG. *bane* 'bahn, weg,' *banen* 'zu einer bahn machen': OE. *bōnian*, MHG. *büenen* 'polish' probably belong here. Cf. E. dial. *boon* 'strassen reparieren.'

543. OHG., MHG. *bast* 'haut, bast, binde,' OHG. *bestan*, MHG. *besten* 'binden, schnüren': MHG. *buost* 'baststrick.'

544. Goth. *ga-batnan* 'vorteil haben,' OHG. *baz* 'besser,' OHG. *bazēn* 'besser werden,' *bezzerōn* 'bessern,' MHG. *bezzern* the same: Goth. *bōtjan* 'nützen,' OHG. *buozan*, MHG. *buozen*, *büezen* 'bessern, vergüten,' OHG. *buoza* 'besserung, vergütung.'

545. OHG. *tagēn*, MHG. *tagen* 'tag werden': Goth. *ahtaudōgs* 'achttägig,' OE. *dōgor* 'tag,' ON. *dǫgr* 'tag und nacht.'

546. ON. *drasenn* 'träge, faul,' *drasa* 'gewäsch, drivel': OE. *drōs* 'dregs, dirt,' OHG. *truosana* 'hefe, bodensatz,' *erdruasnen* 'defaecere.'

547. OHG. *fatunga* 'nahrung,' *vatōn* 'pascere' (in *kavatōt*): Goth. *fōdjan* 'ernähren,' OS. *fōdjan*, OHG. *fuottan*, OE. *fēdan* the same, OHG. *fuotar* 'Nahrung,' OE. *fōdor* 'fodder,' OHG. *fuotiren*, MHG. *fuoteren* 'füttern.'

548. Goth. *fagrs* 'passend,' *faginōn* 'sich freuen,' OHG. *gavagōn* 'satisfacere,' *fagēn*, *fagōn*, MHG. *vagen* 'willfahren,

gehorsam sein,' MHG. *vegen* 'fegen, reinigen': OHG. *fuogan*, MHG. *vüegen*, OS. *fōgian* 'fügen.' Cf. Goth. *gafahrjan* 'zubereiten,' *fahēþs* 'freude.' Cf. No. 272.

549. ON. *falma* 'unsicher tasten': OHG. *fuoljan*, *fualen*, MHG. *vüelen* 'fühlen.'

550. Goth. *fraþi* 'verstand, sinn,' *fraþjan* 'verstehen, denken': Goth. *frōþs* 'weise, brav, verständig,' OS. *frōd*, OHG. *fruot* the same, OHG. *fruoten*, MHG. *vrüeten* 'verständig machen.'

551. MHG. *gate* 'genosse,' *gater* 'zusammen,' OHG. *gatōn*, MHG. *gaten* 'vereinigen, schicklich zusammen kommen,' OHG. *gatern*, MHG. *gatern*, *getern* 'zusammen fügen, vereinigen': Goth. *gōþs* 'gut, tüchtig, schön,' OHG. *guot*, MHG. *ver-güeten* 'vergüten,' *vergüetern* 'mit gütern belehnen.' Cf. Goth. *gadiliggs* 'vetter,' OHG. *gatuling*, MHG. *getelinc*.

552. MHG. *gaffen* 'gaffen,' ON. *gapa* 'gähnen, gaffen': MHG. *guof* 'lautes rufen.'

553. OHG. *grasōn*, MHG. *grasen* 'grasen,' OHG., MHG. *gras:* MHG. *gruose* 'der junge trieb der pflanzen.' Cf. MHG. *grüejen* 'grünen,' *grüenen*.

554. Goth. *haban*, OHG. *habēn*, MHG. *haben* 'haben': Goth. *gahōbains* 'enthaltsamkeit.'

555. OE. *hraca* 'throat,' OHG. *rahho* 'rachen,' OHG. *rachisōn*, MHG. *rahsenen*, *rehsenen*, 'sich laut räuspern, aufhusten': OE. *hrōc* 'rook,' OHG. *ruoh* 'krähe,' OMHG. *ruohelen* 'schreien wie ein esel.'

556. OHG. *lamēn*, MHG. *lamen* 'lahm werden,' OHG. *bilemjan* 'lähmen,' MHG. *lemen* 'lahm machen': OHG. *luomi*, MHG. *lüeme* 'matt,' MHG. *luomen* 'ermatten,' OHG. *luomjan* 'freundlichkeit erweisen,' MHG. *lüemen* 'mattigkeit zeigen, sich lässig erweisen.'

557. Goth. *marei*, OHG. *mari*, *meri* 'meer': OHG., MHG. *muor*, OE. *mōr* 'sumpf,' MHG. *muorzen* 'sumpfig schmecken.'

558. Goth. *matjan* 'essen,' *mats* 'speise,' OS. *mat*, OHG. *maz* the same, MHG. *matzen* 'essen'? (cf. pastēten u. kapūnen matzen): OS. *mōs*, OHG. *muos*, OE. *mōs* 'speise,' OHG. *mōsjan*, MHG. *muosen* 'speisen,' MHG. *gemüese* 'gemüse.'

559. Goth. *namnjan* 'nennen,' OHG. *nemnen*, *nennen*, MHG.

nemmen, nennen, the same, OHG. *namōn*, MHG. *namen* 'benamen,' MHG. *namsen* intens., Goth. *namō*, OHG. *namo*, MHG. *name* 'name': MHG. *benuomen* 'namhaft machen.'

560. Goth. *nati* 'netz,' OHG. *binezzōn*, MHG. *vernetzen* 'mit netz umgeben': ON. *nōt* 'grosses netz.' Cf. OHG. *nazza, nezzila*, MHG. *nezzel* 'nessel.'

561. OHG. *rahha* 'rechenschaft, rede': OHG. *ruoh* 'acht, bedacht,' *ruochen* 'sorgen, rücksicht nehmen.'

562. OHG. *wal* 'kampfplatz,' OE. *wœl* 'die auf dem kampfplatz gebliebenen,' MHG. *walstat* 'schlachtfeld': OHG. *wuolen*, MHG. *wüelen* 'wühlen,' OHG. *wuol* 'verderben.'

563. Goth. *wratōn* 'reisen, wandern,' *wratōdus* 'reise,' ON. *rata* 'wandern, reisen': ON. *rōta*, OE. redup. *wrōtan*, OHG. *ruozjan* 'aufwühlen.'

CLASS VII

564. ON. *baga* 'noget som er forkeert el. fordreiet': *bœgia* 'forttreiben': MHG. *büegen* 'biegen, beugen,' *buoc* 'obergelenk des beines, armes,' OE. *bōg* 'bough.'

565. MHG. *undertœnigen* 'untertan machen': OHG., MHG. *tuon* 'tun, machen.'

566. MHG. *grāpen* 'tasten, greifen,' ON. *grāpa* 'zu sich raffen': *grōp* 'aushöhlung,' OE. *grēpe* 'trench, ditch, drain; burrow': MHG. *grappeln* 'tasten, palpitare.'

567. Goth. *hēþjō* 'kammer': OHG. *huoten*, MHG. *be-hüeten* 'behüten,' OHG. *huot* 'hut, helm,' *huota* 'hut, fürsorge': OE. *hœtt*, E. *hat.*

568. OHG. *rāmēn, rāmen*, MHG. *rāmen, rœmen* 'zielen, trachten,' MHG. *rām* 'ziel': OS. *rōmon* 'zielen, trachten.'

569. OHG. *rāwēn, rāwōn*, MHG. *rāwen* 'ruhe haben, finden,' OHG. *rāwa*, MHG. *rāwe* 'ruhe': OHG. *ruowōn, ruowēn*, MHG. *ruowen* 'ruhe haben, finden': Cf. OHG. *rasta*, MHG. *rast* 'ruhe, rast.'

570. MHG. *smaht* 'das schmachten,' *smahtic* 'hungernd,' *versmahten, versmehten* 'verschmachten': OHG. *casmāhteōn* 'schwinden,' MHG. *versmœhten* 'schmählich behandeln.'

570*a*. OHG. *spratalōn* 'zappeln, palpitare,' NHG., Bav. *spra-*

tzeln 'spritzen': OHG. *sprāt* 'sprühen, spritzen.' Cf. MHG. *sprœjen* 'spritzen, stieben, NHG. *sprühen.*

571. OHG. *statōn*, MHG. *staten* 'an seinen ort bringen,' MHG. *gestatenen* 'befestigen': OHG. *bistātan*, MHG. *bestœten* 'bestätigen, beständig machen,' OHG. *stātigōn* 'befestigen,' MHG. *stœtigen* 'bestehen, bekämpfen.' Cf. Goth. *staþs*, OHG. *stad* 'gestade,' *stedjan* 'anlanden.'

572. MHG. *zadel* 'mangel,' *zadelen* 'in mangel leben,' *tadelen* (from LG.) 'einen tadel, fehler zufügen': OHG. *zādal*, MHG. *zādel* 'mangel,' OHG. *zādalōn* 'mangel leiden.'

573. MHG. *zaf*, *zaft* 'pflege, schmuck, zierde': *zāfe* 'pflege, schmuck,' *zāfen* 'pflegen, in schmuck halten.'

574. Goth. *swēgniþa* 'freude, frohlocken,' *swēgnjan* 'frohlocken': *gaswōgjan* 'seufzen,' *swōgatjan* intens., OE. *swōgan*, *swēgan* 'rauschen, klingen.' Cf. No. 533.

NEW *ABLAUT* FORMS (cf. Introd. Pt. I, p. 2)

575. MHG. *tiselen : taseln* 'tätscheln, tändeln.'

576. OE. *flicerian*, E. *flicker* 'flattern,' Du. *flikkeren* 'sparkle': OE. *flacor* 'flatternd,' ME. *flakeren* 'volitare,' MHG. *vlackern* 'flackern,' ON. *flakka* 'roam about.'

577. MHG. *ver-gagelen* 'vereiteln'? (*du vergaglest das spil*): var. *vergoglest.*

578. MHG. *gagen*, iter. *gageren : gugen* 'sich hin und her wiegen.' *Gagen*, *gugen* 'zur bezeichnung des schwankens der wiege.' Cf. No. 373.

579. MHG. *gigzen* 'unarticulierte töne ausstossen.' Probably a new formation from *gagzen* 'gackern' which belongs to *gāgen*, *gāgern* iter. 'wie eine gans schreien.' Cf. MHG. *gagacken*, *gatzen*, 'schnattern,' OHG. *gagizōn*, *gackazzen* 'strepere.'

580. MHG. *gippen : gappen* ablaut for 'geben' by Neidhart.

581. MHG. *gargeln* 'gurgeln': *gurgeln*, *gorgeln* 'sich gurgeln, einen gurgelnden ton hervorbringen,' OHG. *gurgula*, MHG. *gurgel* 'gurgel.' Cf. No. 448.

581*a*. MHG. *garzen* 'gurgitare': *gurzen* 'eructare.'

582. MHG. *gargitzen : gargatzen* 'gargarizare.'

583. MHG. *girren : garren* (cf. *an der kanzel girren und*

garren), MHG. *garren* 'pfeifen, zwitschern,' MLG. *garren* 'grunzen': MHG. *gurren* 'gurren, girren.' All are sound-words. OE. *gierran* st. v. 'creak, chatter' shows the base.

584. MHG. *gnippen* und *gnappen*, MHG. *gnaben*, *gnappen* 'wackeln, hinken,' ON. *gnapa* 'bend over.'

585. MHG. *grisgramen : grustgramen* 'vor unmut mit den zähnen knirschen' do not properly belong here since each has a group of related words in different ablaut series. Cf. MHG. *grīs* and *grūs*. Still they may have been felt as alternatives like *knirren : knurren* below.

586. MHG. *hippen : happen* for 'haben' by Neidhart.

587. MHG. *hispen* (die locke waren kleine *gehispet*), *hispe* 'fibula, spange': *haspeln* 'haspeln,' OHG. *haspa*, MHG. *haspe*, 'haspe, türhaken, garnwinde.' ON. *hespa* 'fibula,' therefore *hispe* is probably later.

588. MHG. *nipf* 'dormitatio,' *nipfen* 'dormitare, stürzen, nicken': OHG. *hnaffezen*, MHG. *nafzen* 'schlummern,' OE. *hnappian*, E. *nap*.

589. MHG. *kittern* 'kichern': *kuttern* 'girren, lachen.' Cf. *kutzen* 'lachen.'

590. OHG. *kichazzen : kachazzen* 'lachen,' MHG. *kachzen*, *kachen* 'laut lachen,' OE. *ceahhettan* 'lachen.' Cf. Kluge *kichern*.

591. ON. *kippa* 'pull, snatch,' OSw. *kippa* 'chop,' ME. *chippen* 'cut into small pieces,' MHG. *kippen* 'schlagen, stossen' from LG.: ML. Franc. *kappen* 'chop, cut, hew,' NHG. *kappen* 'chop, cut,' ME. *chappen* 'cut, strike': MLFr. *koppen* 'cut off' (not *koppen* = köpfen), ME. *choppen* 'cut, strike.' Cf. MG. *kippe* 'spitze;' *kippen* above also means 'die spitze abhauen.'

592. OHG. *chizilōn*, MHG. *kitzeln*, ON. *kitla:* OHG. *kuzzilōn*, MHG. *kützeln*, OE. *cytelian* 'kitzeln.'

593. MHG. *zer-klicken* 'zerbersten,' Du. *klikken* (cf. klikklakken), NHG. *klicken* 'click, clack': MHG. *klac* 'knack, krach,' *zer-klecken* 'zerschellen,' MLFr. *klacken* 'clack, crack,' MLG. *klaken* 'cluck (as a hen),' ON. *klaka* 'chatter (as a bird),' OHG. *clecchan*, MHG. *klecken* 'crack with a noise': OHG. *klockōn*, MHG. *klocken*, *klucken* 'klopfen,' MHG. *klucken* 'cluck,' E. *clock*, *cluck*, MHG. *kluckern* 'mit schnellkügelchen spielen.'

594. OHG. *klaphōn*, MHG. *klapfen, klaffen*, 'klappen, krachen, schallen, tönen,' MHG. *klaf, klapf* 'knall, krach': OHG. *klopfōn*, MHG. *klopfen* 'klopfen, pochen,' MHG. *klopfel, klüpfel* 'knüppel,' *klupfen* 'erschrecken.' Cf. MHG. *klappern.*

595. MLG., NHG. *knicken* 'knock, break, crack slightly,' MHG. *knicken* 'auf stelzen hinken': MHG. *knacken* 'krachen, knacken,' ME. *cnak* 'krach,' Icel. *knaka*, Norw. *knekkja* 'break, snap': OE. *gecnocian*, ME. *knocken*, ON. *knoka* 'knock, beat.'

596. MHG. *knirren : knarren, gnarren* 'knarren, knurren': NHG. *knurren.* All are sound words. Cf. MHG. *knarpeln* 'knirschen.'

597. MHG. *zerknirsen* 'zerdrücken, zerquetschen,' *knirsunge* 'das knirschen,' NHG. *zerknirschen:* Dutch *knarsen, knersen* 'knirschen, krachen': MHG. *zerknürsen* 'zerdrücken, zerquetschen,' MG. *knorsen* 'balgen, kneten.' Cf. MHG. *knorzen* 'balgen, kneten.'

598. MHG. *kribeln* 'krabbeln (vom kitzel der sinnenlust),' NHG. *kribbeln* 'krabbeln,' Du. *kribelen* 'jucken, stechen,' *kribbelen* 'murren': MHG. *krabbeln, krappeln* 'krabbeln,' MLFr. *krabben* 'kratzen,' NHG. *krabbeln.*

599. OHG. *krizzōn* 'einschneiden': *krazzōn* 'kratzen': Goth. *gakrutōn* 'zermalmen.'

600. OHG. *miskan*, MHG. *mischen* 'mischen': MHG. *müschen, muschen* the same. *Mischen* ablauts regularly with MHG. *meisch* 'mash, traubenmeische,' ME. *maschien* 'mischen.' E. *mash* is felt as a new ablaut of *mish*, so that we have the ablaut *mish, mash, mush* although *mush* may not have belonged here originally. Cf. NHG. *misch-masch* 'gemisch, hodgepodge.'

601. MHG. *niselen* 'näseln, durch die nase sprechen': OHG. *nasa*, MHG. *nase*, OE. *nasu* 'nase': Early NHG. *nuseln* 'näseln.' Cf. MHG. *nustern* 'durch die nase reden,' NHG. *nüstern* 'nasenlöcher.'

602. ON. *nista* 'zusammenheften,' *nist* 'heftnadel am kleide, brooch, pin': OHG. *nestila* 'binde, bandschleife,' MHG. *nesteln* 'festbinden, schnüren': OHG. *nusta* 'verknüpfung.' Cf. OHG. *nuscja*, MHG. *nusche* 'gürtelschnall.' Cf. No. 466.

603. MHG. *raffeln* 'lärmen, schelten,' *raffel* 'getöse, lärm': *ruffen* 'lärmen.'

604. OHG. *salzan* st. redup., MHG. *salzen* 'salzen': OHG. *sulza*, MHG. *sulze*, *sulz* 'salzwasser,' *sulzen*, *sülzen* 'einsülzen.'

605. MHG. *slicken : slucken* 'schlingen, schlucken.' Cf. Nos. 48, 123.

606. Beside the regular forms *smerzen : smurzen* in MHG., we have also *smirzen : smurzen* 'schmerzen.'

607. MHG. *gesnipfen : gesnupfen* 'das haupt senken.'

608. MG. *snippen:* MHG. *snappen* 'schnappen, wanken, straucheln.' Cf. E. *snip : snap*, NHG. *schnippschnappschnurr.*

609. MHG. *spirzeln : spürzeln*, *spurzelen* 'speien, spucken.' Cf. *spirzen : spürzen* the same.

610. MHG. *zipfel* 'spitzes ende': *zapfe* 'zapfen,' OHG. *zapfo* the same. Cf. E. *tip* and *tap* (of a shoe e. g.), *top*, NHG. *zopf.*

611. NHG. *zippeln* 'trippeln': MHG. *zappeln* 'zappeln, schwanken.' Cf. MHG. *zipel und zapel über daz fletz; zipfen* 'in kleinen ansätzen gehen, trippeln,' *zippelzēhen* 'trippelnd auf *zēhen* gehen.'

612. MHG. *zispen* 'schleifend gehen': *zaspen* 'scharren, mit füssen schlürfen.'

613. MHG. *zwicken : zwacken* 'zwicken, zerren.'

614. MHG. *wach : woch* 'interjection des staunens,' *wochzen* '*woch* rufen.'

CORRECTION.—Under *gīgen* Pt. I the reference should read No. 577 instead of 557.

CHARLES GOETTSCH

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE SOURCES OF JONSON'S *MASQUE OF CHRISTMAS* AND *LOVE'S WELCOME AT WELBECK*

Attention has apparently not been called to Jonson's use of the sword-dance as the basis of *The Masque of Christmas* nor to the agreement of his last masque, *Love's Welcome at Welbeck*, with part of Laneham's account of the sports at Kenilworth. His indebtedness to *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* for the part of Venus in *The Masque of Christmas* has already been suggested.

The main feature of *The Masque of Christmas*, a sword-dance song, is relieved by some burlesque of city manners, chiefly in the figures of Venus, the typical city wife of comedy, and Cupid, her son, the prentice actor. These characters and most of the details of treatment are drawn from *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*.[1] Venus, indeed, is merely a miniature of the Citizen's Wife of the play. Each, thrusting herself upon the stage with the citizen's sense of importance, assumes the guardianship and direction of the lubberly prentice actor, and each, unabashed and garrulous, constantly interrupts the players, regardless of the course of the drama.

Venus, like the Citizen and Wife, enters in the midst of the prologue, and, after giving a history of herself and family,[2] begins an account of Cupid's talents:

> Ay, forsooth, he'll say his part, I warrant him, as well as e'er a playboy of 'em all: I could ha' had money enough for him an I would have been tempted, and ha' let him out by the week to the king's players. Master Burbage has been about and about with me, and so has old Master Hemings too, they ha' need of him: where is he, trow, ha! I would fain see him—pray God they have given him some drink since he came.

[1] Professor Manly first directed my attention to *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* as the source for Venus's utterances in *The Masque of Christmas*. Already Dr. Winter (*Staple of News*, *Yale Studies in English*, Vol. XXVIII, p. xxxiii and p. 149) had pointed out the similarity of Venus and of the gossips in the induction and intermeans of *The Staple of News* to the Citizen and Wife in *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*. In his usual way, Jonson marks the connection between these two works of his, calling Mirth of *The Staple of News* "the daughter of Christmas, and spirit of Shrovetide."

[2] The typical details and characters of these scenes are also dealt with by Jonson in *Love Restored* and *The Masque of Augurs*. There is much overlapping in the three masques.

The Citizen and his Wife in scattered speeches have much the same things to say of Ralph. "Beshrew me," the Wife declares, "if I do not think he will go beyond them all,"[1] and much more in the same vein. The Citizen's remark that the players would give all the shoes in their shop for Ralph[2] is like Venus's boast of the great demand for Cupid's services. The Citizen's Wife, too, grows solicitous about her ward. "I would have Ralph," she says, ". . . . I tell you truly, I'm afraid o' my boy. . . . . say they should put him into a strait pair of gaskins, 'twere worse than knot-grass; he would never grow after it."[3] When Cupid comes out to speak, Venus breaks in with encouragement: "'Tis a good child, speak out; hold up your head, Love," and, "Ay, that's a good boy, speak plain, Robin." Correspondingly, the Citizen's Wife says to Ralph: "Hold up thy head, Ralph; shew the gentlemen what thou canst do; speak a huffing part,"[4] and "It's a good boy, hold up thy head, and be not afraid."[5] Venus's apology for the frightened Cupid is: "He was never in such an assembly before, forsooth, but once at the Warmoll Quest, forsooth, where he said grace as prettily as any of the sheriff's hinchboys, forsooth." The Citizen's Wife makes a similar apology for herself when she ascends the stage: "I'm a stranger here; I was ne'er at one of these plays, as they say, before; but I should have seen *Jane Shore* once."[6]

Another similarity is found in the satire against the acting of the citizens and in the realism secured through the author's dis-

[1] Induction to *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, Dyce's edition of Beaumont and Fletcher's *Works*, Vol. II, p. 134. Hereafter I shall cite, in addition to the act and scene, only the page of this volume for *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*. Jonson's masques are too short to need citation by page.

[2] *Kn. of B. P.*, I, iii, p. 147.

[3] *Ibid.*, II, ii, p. 157. The Citizen's Wife also sends Ralph licorice to "open his pipes the better" (I, i, p. 139). She has ginger at hand, too, to offer the wounded Humphrey (II, iv, p. 164). So Venus furnishes cloves to New-Year's-Gift and elsewhere says that she has warm waters for Cupid if he be cold.

[4] *Kn. of B. P.*, Ind., p. 134.

[5] *Ibid.*, II, ii, p. 157. Very similar is Venus' earlier statement, "He is a pretty child." Compare *Kn. of B. P.*: "Sirrah, didst thou ever see a prettier child?" and, "The childer are pretty childer" (I, i, p. 140); "It's a fine child" (I, iii, p. 148), etc. These, like the repetition of *forsooth*, *warrant*, etc., in the two pieces, represent the usual satire on the citizen's power of expression.

[6] *Kn. of B. P.*, Ind., p. 133.

claimer in the mouths of the regular actors[1] of any responsibility for the citizens' parts. Thus many mock attempts are made to hush Venus in order that the dance may proceed, and the Citizen's Wife is repeatedly told that Ralph's part will ruin the plot.[2] When Cupid forgets his speech in the confusion created by his mother, Christmas says, "Nay, he is out enough . . . . : this it is to have speeches." The downfall of Cupid and the incongruous, melodramatic death which is the only conclusion the Citizen's Wife can devise for Ralph's part, left hanging on at the end, emphasize the satire on the dramatic tastes and gifts of the citizens.[3]

As for the song and the accompanying dance in *The Masque of Christmas*, Jonson declares his purpose in one stanza of the song:

> Now their intent is above to present,
> With all the appurtenances,
> A right Christmas, as of old it was,
> To be gathered out of the dances.

While a reading of the masque will convince one that the "right Christmas" was the result of some adaptation by Jonson, a comparison of his work with the folk-play as preserved and with some popular elements in Elizabethan literature shows, as far as one can reconstruct the old out of what has come down after several centuries of oral tradition, a surprising faithfulness on the part of Jonson. The song agrees very closely with that in one form of the extant sword-dance play, and the characters are certainly in part drawn from popular tradition. Even where Jonson must

[1] Offering in Jonson's masque says, "Misrule doth not like his suit; he says the players have lent him one too little, on purpose to disgrace him," and Christmas replies, "What! shall we proclaim where we were furnished?" See the Wife's demand in the *Kn. of B. P.* (Ind., p. 134) that the players furnish Ralph a suit.

The delay in the masque on account of the lack of certain properties and the jesting as the result of the situation are paralleled, as I have elsewhere pointed out, in the play of *Sir Thomas More* when *The Marriage of Witt and Wisedome* is introduced.

[2] *Kn. of B. P.*, II, iv; III, iii; IV, i.

[3] There is in both the masque and the play an expression of the citizens' pride in performances that belong to London and to the people. Christmas declares in the prologue to *The Masque of Christmas:* "The truth is, I have brought a Masque here out o' the city, of my own making, and do present it by a set of my sons, that come out of the lanes of London." Compare the Citizen's command to the actors: "Why, present something notably in honour of the commons of the city," and again, "I will have a citizen, and he shall be of my own trade" (*Kn. of B. P.*, Ind., pp. 132 and 133).

have adapted material or where parallels cannot be found for his details, the real spirit of the folk-play seems to have been preserved.

The sword-dance verses used here by Jonson belong to the simpler type,[1] having in place of dialogue merely a chorus sung by the leader, in which the dancers are introduced in turn and characterized.[2] *The Masque of Christmas* follows closely the form of the Yorkshire and Durham sword-dance songs, with Christmas as the presenter, however, taken from the Christmas mummers' play. The prologue opens with the prayer for the audience,[3] which often occurs in the epilogue, and then gives in the conventional way the place from which the actors come, their number,[4] and the purpose of the entertainment. The next step reminds one strongly of the Revesby Sword Play, in which the Fool, after having spoken a prologue with the same elements as Jonson's, calls for music and summons his sons, who "foot it once round the room" and begin their song. Christmas, addressing first his sons and daughters[5] and then the musicians, says, "Are you ready, boys! Strike up." Two quatrains of the prologue

[1] Ordish, *Folk-Lore*, Vol. II, pp. 314 ff. and Vol. IV, pp. 149 ff., and Chambers, *Med. Stage*, Vol. I, chaps. ix and x, treat the various sword-dance songs and mummers' plays. See Chambers, pp. 190–95, for a discussion of the kind that Jonson uses and for references to the various printed versions.

The practical confinement of the sword-dance songs at the present day to a section of the north of England, around Durham and Yorkshire especially, falls in with some indications as to the source of most of Jonson's folk-lore, which seems to belong to the North Midlands. *The Satyr* (1603) was presented at Althorpe in Northamptonshire, and possibly was worked up there from local material, the morris dance having been presented by natives, of their own initiative. *The Gipsies Metamorphosed* (1621) and *Love's Welcome at Welbeck* (1633) celebrate "Darbyshire" and Nottinghamshire, while it is presumable that Jonson had some local color from Sherwood and its inhabitants in *The Sad Shepherd;* Whalley points out that Paplewick, where Maudlin resides, is between Nottingham and Mansfield, and Mansfield is the scene of the labors of Accidence, the schoolmaster in *Love's Welcome at Welbeck*. All this may have some bearing upon the date of *The Sad Shepherd*.

[2] I do not believe that these verses accompany the movements of the dancers in Jonson's masque or in the sword-dances, as Ordish seems to think (*Folk-Lore*, Vol. IV, p. 153). See Henderson, *Notes on the Folk-Lore of the Northern Counties of England and the Borders*, pp. 68 f.; the stage directions for the Revesby Sword Play, Manly, *Spec. Pre-Shak. Drama*, Vol. I, pp. 298 and 299 for the circle and 305 for the dance. In *Love's Welcome at Welbeck* the dance is accompanied by song, as the morris dance often is.

[3] All the masquers sing this stanza, the only one in which any character besides Christmas seems to take part, except one given to Cupid.

[4] Cf. "Six actors I have brought," *County Folk-Lore*, Vol. IV, p. 81; and Henderson *Notes on Folk-Lore*, etc., p. 68, where "five" is substituted for "six."

[5] Before Christmas begins his song, the children appear in a pageant, with the masquers' usual torch-bearers. They seem to come forward here in another capacity, as sword-dancers, and the torch-bearers evidently have no part with them.

follow this warning, and then the stage direction reads: "Here the drum and fife sounds, and they march about once. In the second coming up, Christmas proceeds in his song." This passing around the circle forms an integral part in the action of the sword-dancers.[1] The prologue ended, Christmas proceeds to characterize his children in turn, just as the personages in the sword-dance are characterized, his two daughters corresponding, I take it, to the usual woman. Then follows the dance, which, according to Jonson's custom, is not described. The epilogue rounds out the form common in the folk-plays, though its matter is hardly of the usual type.

The first of Jonson's characters, Christmas as the presenter, represents the leader of the sword-dance songs and of the mummers' plays. At his entrance he gives his name[2] as Old Christmas and Captain Christmas. As Old Christmas, the father of the dancers, he corresponds to Old Father Christmas, the presenter in many modern versions of the Christmas mummers' play;[3] and as captain he retains the title that occurs for the leader in several versions both of the play and of the song for the sword-dance.[4] The stage names of the other characters are unlike the majority of the names that have came down to us in the folk-plays. Of the sons and daughters of Christmas—Misrule, Carol, Mince-pie, Gambol, Post and Pair, New-Year's-Gift, Mumming, Wassel, Offering, and Baby-cake—only the name Mince-pie occurs in a modern version, and that but once, in a play of St. Mary Bourne, Hampshire.[5] This is not the only indication, however, that such names as those of the masque have been applied popularly to Christmas revelers and hence may have been used in the folk-

[1] Cf. Ordish, *Folk-Lore*, Vol. IV, p. 153. Chambers, *Med. Stage*, Vol. I, p. 129, points out what we must feel in reading the Revesby Play and others, that the circle has more significance than the mere clearing of a space, which is its purpose according to Ordish.

[2] Usually each character who speaks in the plays begins by giving his name.

[3] Chambers, *Med. Stage*, Vol. I, p. 216; Ditchfield, *Old Eng. Customs*, p. 320; 2 Ser. *Notes and Queries*, Vol. XII, p. 493; 5 *N. and Q.*, Vol. X, p. 489; *Folk-Lore Record*, Vol. III, pp. 92 and 102; *Folk-Lore Journal*, Vol. II, p. 2; etc.

[4] *County Folk-Lore*, Vol. IV, p. 81; Manly, *Spec. Pre-Shak. Drama*, Vol. I, p. 292; Halliwell, *Popular Rhymes*, p. 244. In *Gipsies Metamorphosed* Jonson again uses captain as the title for the leader of a dance.

Chambers (*Med. Stage*, Vol. I, p. 216) says, "At St. Mary Bourne Christmas is accompanied by 'Mince-Pie.'" I have not been able to see the play, published according to Chambers in Stevens's *Hist. of St. Mary Bourne*, p. 340.

drama. In the *Mask of the Four Seasons*,[1] where each season introduces an appropriate sport, Winter sends in "Christmas Gamboles," who is also called merely "Gamboles." Ashton[2] describes a tract published in 1645, *The Arraignment, Conviction, and Imprisonment of Christmas . . . . Printed by Simon Minc'd Pye, for Cissely Plum-Porridge; And are to be sold by Ralph Fidler, Chandler, at the signe of the Pack of Cards in Mustard-Alley, in Brawn Street.* The names of characters and places here are of the same type as Jonson's, and Plum-porridge has the given name Cissely, which Mince-pie bears in *The Masque of Christmas*. Plum-porridge occurs again as a character in Middleton's *Inner-Temple Masque*, which also mentions in the will of Kersmas[3] a number of sons and daughters named for card games and corresponding in function to Post and Pair, though Post and Pair does not occur. This will of Kersmas has bequests also to "my nephew Gambols" and "my cousin-german, Wassail-bowl."[4] It is thus probable that in other instances than those of Old Christmas and Mince-pie Jonson's masque shows traces of the popular names for Christmas mummers. Of course there is the possibility, however, that the grouping of characters in Middleton's *Inner-Temple*

[1] Collier, *Five Court Masques*, Shakespeare Society, 1848, pp. 143 ff.

[2] *A righte Merrie Christmasse!!!* pp. 29 ff.

[3] Bullen, *Works of Middleton*, Vol. VII, pp. 204, 205.

[4] The evidence that Middleton was merely using popular names seems to me strengthened by the presence of popular elements in his masque. He says in some lines prefatory to the masque:

> "This nothing owes to any tale or story
> With which some writer pieces up a glory;
> I only made the time, they sat to see,
> Serve for the mirth itself, which was found free;"

that is, I presume, the season festivals, the basis, no doubt, of Middleton's masque, were found free. Dr. Almanac probably corresponds to the doctor of the mummers' play, though the original function is hardly preserved, for he merely comes from the funeral of the Old Year and is the herald of the New Year—a dim echo of the *renouveau*. (See Middleton's use of the word sword-dance, comparatively rare at his time, in *Chaste Maid in Cheapside*, IV, iii, 9, as further evidence of his knowledge of the play.) The will of Kersmas seems to me to belong to popular plays or season festivals. In the Revesby Sword Play, the Fool, whose function in the folk-drama Christmas has taken over in almost every version where Christmas appears, makes his will upon the point of death, as Kersmas does in Middleton's masque. (In a Devonshire play, *Folk-Lore Record*, Vol. III, pp. 102 ff., where Old Father Christmas is decidedly the Fool of the play, we have, instead of the death of Christmas, the slaying in succession of his four sons, no doubt the seasons originally.) Nashe's *Summer's Last Will and Testament*, with its morris dance, its May song and dance, its harvest home, and other features of season festivals, contains the will of Summer, similar in its humorous spirit and in some details to the will of Middleton's Kersmas. On the whole, it seems to me that the making of such a will is rather a part of popular tradition represented in the Revesby Play than a literary devise that has crept into that play.

Masque (1618) and *The Arraignment . . . . of Christmas* (1645) was borrowed from Jonson's *Masque of Christmas* (*ca.* 1616) or that all three resulted from some literary fashion.

In his manner of presenting the characters Jonson has certainly followed the popular form.[1] The first of the dancers to be introduced[2] is Tom of Bosoms-inn,[3] who presents Misrule. Tommy is almost synonymous with the fool in the sword-dance and often elsewhere, as Tom o' Bedlam, though Misrule is hardly the special fool of the masque. Next Kit Cobbler, a "kill-pot," who "dwells in the lane called Fill-pot," plays Carol, with his flute at his girdle. As there is no indication that Carol uses the flute, it would perhaps be going too far to suggest that he possibly has the function of the usual taborer or piper of the sword-dances. Kill-pot and Fill-pot may have been chosen because of their suggestion of Tosspot, one of the characters of the sword-dance.[4] Then comes Cis, an honest cook's wife of Scalding-alley. The name Cis or Cicely is frequently met in connection with the sports of the people.[5] Hercules, a porter of Distaff-lane, dressed like a tumbler with hoop and bells, plays Gambol. Perhaps his

[1] Each character of the mummers' plays and sword-dance songs is introduced and humorously described, not only his name as a masquer being told, but his given name or his occupation or both. In the sword-dances there are such characters as a vintner, a tailor, a sailor, a pitman, and a sempstress. (Only the last occurs in *The Masque of Christmas.*) Besides the usual soldier and doctor, we find among others in the mummers' plays Tom the Tinker, Little Johnny Sweep (see Chambers, *Med. Stage*, Vol. I, p. 214), and the farmer of the Plough Monday Play (9 *N. and Q.*, Vol. VII, pp. 322, 323). The difference in the type of occupation is to be ascribed to locality in the folk-drama and in Jonson also.

[2] Cupid is introduced first in the song, but Christmas states that the dancers are brought before the King

> "by love; who over and above,
> Doth draw himself in the geer too."

The rôle of Cupid and his mother is probably a substitute for the clownish tricks of the Tommy and the Bessy (Chambers, *Med. Stage*, Vol. I, p. 192), though I do not suppose that Cupid and Venus owe anything to folk-lore.

[3] The part played by the inns in furnishing performers for the country sports is perhaps illustrated by the morris dance of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (III, 5) and by the dance in the second anti-masque of Beaumont's *Masque of the Inner-Temple and Gray's Inn.*

[4] Halliwell, *Popular Rhymes*, p. 244; Bell, *Early Ballads and Ballads and Songs of the Peasantry of England*, p. 402. Compare Love-ale of one version (Bell, p. 394). Tom Tosspot is a character of Fulwell's *Like Wil to Like.*

[5] Cf. *The Arraignment . . . . of Christmas* above; Cicely of the Revesby Sword Play; Jonson's *Gipsies Metamorphosed; Two Noble Kinsmen*, III, v; *Laneham's Letter*, Furnivall's edit., p. 23. In a Durham sword-dance song, one of the characters is the King of Sicily, who is to marry the presenter's daughter.

part in the dance was that of a tumbler.[1] Post and Pair is presented by a card-maker in Pur-alley; Mumming by Mac-pippin, a costermonger; and New-Year's-Gift by Clem[2] Waspe of Honey-lane, with a collar of gingerbread. The puns seem more evident here than any suggestion of sword-dancers. The next stanza reads:

> This I you tell is our jolly Wassel,
> And for Twelfth-night more meet too:
> She works by the ell, and her name is Nell,
> And she dwells in Threadneedle-street too.

A Wharfdale (Yorkshire) sword-dance has a fairly close parallel:

> The next that enters on the floor,
> . . . . . .
> . . Bridget is her name,
> At needlework she doth excel
> All that e'er learnt to sew.[3]

Then follows Little-worth of Penny-rich street representing Offering, and finally "child Rowlan" of Crooked-lane as Baby-cake. We have in "child Rowlan" an obvious reference to the ballad hero, and perhaps he had found his way into the sword-dance,[4] as Old King Cole, Giant Blunderbore, and King Alfred found their way into one of the mummers' plays.[5] The likeness of these

[1] See Douce, *Illus. of Sh.*, Vol. II, p. 436, and *Century Dictionary* under "matachin" for tumbling as a part of some varieties of the sword-dance.

Chambers claims that in England the use of bells differentiates the morris from the sword-dance in modern times (*Med. Stage*, Vol. I, pp. 200, 201). But, if we have in *The Masque of Christmas* a sword-dance, Gambol's bells and the "gingling sally" of Post and Pair would indicate that at least for Jonson's day this distinction would not hold. Furthermore, Nares's definition, quoted from Douce, of the matachin, the name given the sword-dance at that time, states that bells were usual in it. A confusion of the morris with other dances in Jonson's day seems to be indicated by a passage in *The Gipsies Metamorphosed*, where the clowns debate whether the gipsy dance is a morris, comparing the "gingle" of the bells in the two.

[2] Clem may be a popular name derived from the celebration of St. Clement's Day. Gingerbread cakes in the form of gloves are spoken of as gifts at bridales in *Barth. Fair*, III, i.

[3] Bell, *Early Ballads and Ballads and Songs of the Peasantry of England*, p. 394. For a possible explanation of the presence of the sempstress and representatives of some other occupations, see Chambers, *Med. Stage*, Vol. I, pp. 188, 189.

[4] Warner's *MSS and Mun. of Dulwich Coll.*, p. 61, contains, printed as prose, a fragment of dialogue belonging to Jonson's time in which Rowland is mentioned. It is evidently from some old versified folk-play, and is related, as Professor Manly pointed out to me, to the Revesby Sword Play.

> "Whie, bony Dicky, I will not forsake
> my bony rowland for any gold;
> if he can daunce as well as perce,
> he shall have my hart in hold."

[5] Manly, *Spec. Pre-Shak. Drama*, Vol. I, p. 289.

characters to those in the sword-dance songs, while not close, can hardly be doubted. The whole, however, is complicated by the punning on the names of the streets of London, an exercise which recalls such songs of inns as that in Heywood's *Rape of Lucrece* (1608).[1]

Christmas tells us in regard to the number of performers,

> There should have been, and a dozen I ween.

That the twelve would have been actual dancers we gather from his explanation that, if Log, his eleventh child, had not been "too heavy to dance it," he himself "would have been the twelfth." Consequently, in Jonson's masque, Christmas as the presenter is the only one who does not take part in the dance, while in the modern folk-play there are usually only five or six actual dancers,[2] often with several clowns, musicians, and other attendants. Grimm[3] mentions twelve as the number in the older German sword-dance, and Jonson's statement as to the usual number no doubt represents the same old tradition.

Hints of how the dance itself was performed in *The Masque of Christmas* are very few. The description of the costumes has no mention of swords, though Jonson speaks of the porter's staff of Offering and the dagger of Baby-cake. It is possible that swords were used, nevertheless. At any rate, there are some passages that seem to refer to the martial nature of the dance. In the first, which is of very dubious value, it is said of the dancers that "each hath his knight for to carry his light," and the "knight" may or may not have been suggested by the character of the dance. In the second, however, the reference is unmistakable. After the dancers have marched around the conventional circle, to the sound of drum and fife, Christmas cries:

> No more of your martial music;
> Even for the sake o' the next new stake,[4]
> For there I do mean to use it.

[1] Rimbault gives this, "London's Ordinary," and another song of inns in his *Little Book of Songs and Ballads*, No. 70.

[2] Henderson, *Notes on Folk-Lore*, etc., p. 68.

[3] *Deutsche Mythologie*, trans. Stallybrass, Vol. II, p. 780.

[4] The stake, the bells, the large number of dancers, and the absence of attendants who do not dance and of their comic dialogue must belong to the dance in an older form than that which we know.

The passage seems to me to mean that the martial music must cease until the martial dance begins around the new stake set up for the sword-dance. Perhaps, too, there is a contrast intended, in the first stanza of the epilogue, between this obsolete war custom and the modern:

> Nor do you think that their legs is all
> The commendation of my sons,
> For at the Artillery garden they shall
> As well forsooth use their guns.

The Masque of Christmas does not furnish many verbal resemblances to the modern versions of the sword-play. Even Jonson's quatrains are dissimilar to the regular quatrain of the sword-dance song, having longer lines and more intricate rhymes. They can be paralleled, of course, and the rhyme system sometimes occurs in folk-songs.[1] Moreover, a few parallels like the introduction of the sempstress above can be adduced. "Mum! mum!" Christmas's call for quiet as the dancers are brought in, is still found in the sword-dance.[2] In the epilogue the line,

> Such an ac-ativity as this,

is no doubt an echo of the mummers' frequent boast as to their activity.[3] Activity appears as a character in one of the plays, and is offset by Age.[4] Jonson's spelling is probably in imitation of the popular pronunciation of the word.

In *Love's Welcome at Welbeck* Jonson has furnished a setting for country sports and dances[5] which is similar in some respects to his adaptation of the sword-dance in *The Masque of Christmas*. Here there are two presenters instead of one.[6] The bridegroom and his six attendants are introduced by them in the same formal

[1] Ditchfield, *Old Eng. Customs*, pp. 99, 106, and 109; Dorsetshire Play, *Folk-Lore Record*, Vol. III, p. 93 (St. George's speech).

[2] *Folk-Lore*, Vol. IV, p. 162. Usually the opening words of the modern folk-play are, "Room! room!" and these are found in the opening of *The Masque of Owls* when Captain Cox enters on a hobby-horse and in *Pan's Anniversary* when the Fencer enters.

[3] Cf. plays in 2 *N. and Q.*, Vol. X, p. 466; 2 *N. and Q.*, Vol. XI, p. 271; and 4 *N. and Q.*, Vol. X, p. 487.

[4] 2 *N and Q.*, Vol. XII, p. 487.

[5] In *The Satyr* (1603) there is a speech which Jonson wrote for a company of morris dancers who appeared before the queen and prince at Althorpe. Here the speech is evidently not an integral part of the performance, as in the other two masques.

[6] One of the presenters, Accidence, "the painful instructor of our youth in their country elements," corresponds to the pedant who writes the speech for the morris dance in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, III, 5.

way as in the *Masque of Christmas*, usually with the occupation mentioned. The stanzas, not sung in this case but recited, are continued through the course at quintain and describe the career of the knights in turn.

The part of the presenters is probably entirely Jonson's, but the actors were country people of Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire, as Jonson tells us, and his verses, I take it, merely describe their performance. The agreement of the Welbeck sports with part of those at Kenilworth described by Laneham[1] gives a good idea of how much of his material for the masque Jonson probably owed to his actors. Both at Kenilworth and at Welbeck, the sports take the form of a mock bridale, whose special features are a course at quintain with the bridegroom and his attendants as riders, the introduction of the bride and an elaborate bridal party, and finally a country dance, all pervaded by a spirit of exaggerated clownishness. The order is not the same, however, and Laneham, after describing the participants in the sports as they enter in procession and then giving an account of the quintain, dismisses the bridale and dance with the statement that they had not the "full muster waz hoped for."

The riders in the quintain at Kenilworth are described by Laneham as "lustie lads and bolld bachelarz of the parish;" those at Welbeck are "bold bachelors," who "come in at the country charge." The courses at quintain, too, involve the same clownish mishaps, which, as Jonson says,

> . . . . miss or hit,
> Intended are for the shire-wit.

Of the bridegroom at Kenilworth it is said after his adventure at quintain that he "lost not hiz styrops (for he had none too his saddl);" and of Russet Hood, a Welbeck rider, that he "lost no stirrup, for he had none." Similarly, Stub, "being to dance, ... would not trouble himself with boots;" and Laneham's knights have "sum botes & no spurz, he spurz & no boots, and he neyther nother." Again, it is said of Stub that he

> Hath challenged either wide countee;
> Come Cut and Long-tail;

[1] *Captain Cox, or Laneham's Letter*, Furnivall's edition, pp. 20-26 and p. 32.

while at Kenilworth the bridegroom and his band ran "a whyle in sum order, but soon after, tag and rag, cut & long tail." "Cut and long-tail" must, however, have been a favorite term for the promiscuous entries of the game. Laneham's "buff at the man, and the coounterbuff at the hors" is matched by Jonson's "cuff . . . . o' the sand-bag's counterbuff."

There is some correspondence, too, between the brides and their attendants, though Jonson is nothing like so detailed as Laneham. Pem is described as

> . . . . a daughter stale
> In Darby town,
> Known up and down
> For a great antiquity;
> . . . . . .
> A solemn wight,

and the bride at Kenilworth is "a stale stallion . . . .: a thirtie yéer old, of colour brounbay, ... vgly, fooul, ill fauord." Each is attended by a bevy of rustic bridesmaids. The Welbeck bride has a cake-bearer and a bowl-bearer, "like two twin clowns prest out for that office." At Kenilworth the cup-bearer is a "loouely loober woorts, freklfaced, red headed;" and for the one cake-bearer of Welbeck there are "thrée prety puzels az bright az a breast of bacon, of a thirtie yéere old a pées."

In regard to the dances, we are told that the one at Kenilworth was "a liuely morisdauns, according too the auncient manner, six daunserz, Mawdmarion, and the fool." In Jonson's masque, the words of the bridal song are "set to a tune, and sung to the bag-pipe, and measure of their dance." Possibly the entire bridal party joined in the dance. I venture to guess, however, that only the bridegroom, the bride,[1] and the six attendants of the bride-groom engaged in it, and that the dance was akin to the morris and "according too the auncient manner." Pem, who is "drest like an old May-lady," is upon record as having outdanced her "yeoman or May-lord;" and the six attendants are the six Hoods,[2]

[1] It is said of the Kenilworth bride that she was "fain of the offis, because shee hard say shee shoold dauns before the Quéen," but she is not mentioned with the morris dancers nor is any other dance mentioned.

[2] To me the naming of the six attendants by color and an article of dress suggests Blue Breeches, Ginger Breeches, and Pepper Breeches of the Revesby Sword Play.

said to be of the blood of Robin Hood, fit companions for the May lord and lady in the dance.

There are in the two accounts hints, also, that the characters dressed much alike for the two bridales; but, in spite of the sixty years that intervened between the entertainments at Kenilworth and at Welbeck, most of these similarities might have occurred without any special reference to the sports.[1] Jonson, however, may have borrowed one thing from the Kenilworth costumes: Accidence has "the trust of the town-pen-and-inkhorn committed to the suretie of his girdle," and the bridegroom at Kenilworth has "a pen & inkorn at his bak, for he woold be knowen to be bookish."

There can be little doubt, I think, that in writing his masque Jonson at times made use of Laneham's *Letter*. This is all the more likely since from Laneham must have come the entry of Captain Cox in Jonson's *Masque of Owls* and the account there of his appearance at Kenilworth and of his library. But Jonson, no doubt, drew much of his material from the country people who were in the sports, and it is very probable that the sports popular with the Welbeck folk were very similar to those popular at Kenilworth.

C. R. Baskervill

The University of Chicago

[1] There are such similarities as the "yellow canvas doublet, cut" of Stub and the "nu cut canuas dooblet" of the Kenilworth bowl-bearer; or the "buckram bride-laces begilt" of Jonson's bridesmaids and the "brydelaces of . . . . buckeram begilded" on the bride-cup at Kenilworth.

Modern Philology

Vol. VI *January, 1909* No. 3

PIERS PLOWMAN

THE WORK OF ONE OR OF FIVE

I

Next to the *Canterbury Tales*, the poem usually called *Piers Plowman* is the greatest literary work produced by England during the Middle Ages; and it was considered so from the first, these two poems being almost equally popular. Fifty-seven manuscripts have preserved for us Chaucer's tales; forty-five *Piers Plowman*. This latter work is a unique monument, much more singular and apart from anything else than Chaucer's masterpiece. It is more thoroughly English; of foreign influences on it there are but the faintest traces. Allegorical as it is, it gives us an image of English life in the fourteenth century of unsurpassed vividness. If we had only Chaucer we would know much less; Chaucer is at his best when describing individuals; his portraits are priceless. The author of *Piers Plowman* concerns himself especially with classes of men, great political movements, the general aspirations of the people, the improvements necessary in each class for the welfare of the nation. Contemporary events and the lessons to be deducted from them, the hopes, anxieties, problems, and sufferings occupying his compatriots' minds, are never far from his thoughts: plague, storms, French wars, question of labor and wages, bishops becoming royal functionaries, power of the Commons and the king, duties of the nobles, the priests, the workmen. He does not

describe them simply to add picturesque touches, but to express what he feels and show how the nation should be governed and be morally improved. He is not above his time, but of it; he is not a citizen of the world, but a thoroughgoing Englishman and nothing else. Alone in Europe, and, what is more remarkable, alone in his country, he gives us a true impression of the grandeur of the internal reform that had been going on in England during the century: the establishment on a firm basis of that institution, unique then, and destined to be imitated throughout the world, in both hemispheres five hundred years later, the Westminster Parliament. The equivalent of such a line as the following one on the power of king, nobles, and Commons:

> Knyghthood hym ladde,
> Might of the comunes made hym to regne,[1]

can be found nowhere in the whole range of mediaeval literature; it has but one real equivalent (inaccessible then to the public), the Rolls of Parliament.

No one came in any way near this writer, less than any the great man who, from the window of his chamber in Aldgate tower, cast such a friendly look on the world, such a true citizen of it that, although he had taken part in the French wars, one could, but for the language, read his whole works without guessing on which side he had fought. Himself a member of Parliament, he who described so many men of so many sorts has not left in the whole series of his works a line, a word, allowing his readers to suspect the magnitude of the change England was undergoing; even Froissart gives a better idea of it than he does. His franklin he describes as having been "ful ofte tyme" a "knight of the schire," and instead of something on the part he may have played then, we simply get thereupon the information that

> An anlas and a gipser al of silk
> Heng at his gerdul, whit as morne mylk.

Neither of these two great authors is entirely lacking in the qualities of the other; but reading Chaucer we know better what England looked like, reading *Piers Plowman* we know better what she felt, suffered from, and longed for.

[1] B, Prol. 112.

Deeply concerned with the grave problems confronting his countrymen, the author of *Piers Plowman* seems to have been one of those writers, not a unique case in literature, whose life and book develop together, the one reflecting necessarily the change that years and circumstances may have worked in the other. The life and *the* book of such men as Montaigne, Rabelais, Tasso, Cervantes, especially the two former, may be quoted as offering parallelisms of the same order.

The *Piers Plowman* visions, made up of a mixture of vague allegories and intensely vivid realities, deal with three principal episodes, the main lines of which the author seems to have had in his mind from the first, the episode of Meed, the episode of Piers Plowman, and the search for Dowel, Dobet, Dobest. Piers Plowman reappears in the last episode; he is the most important and characteristic personage in the work, hence its title. The author, who, like Montaigne for his essays, seems to have been constantly rewriting his poem, gave, as is well known, three principal versions of it, which can be dated from the historical allusions in them: A, 1362–63; B, 1376–77; C, 1398–99.

When a man takes, so to say, for his life's companion and confidant a work of his, adding new parts or new thoughts as years pass on, and as events put their impress on his mind, the way in which these remakings are carried on is ever the same: circumstances command them. The author has before him a copy of his first and shortest text, and he makes here and there, as it occurs to him, an emendation, alters a word or a passage which he thinks he can improve, or which no longer corresponds to his way of thinking; he corrects mistakes and occasionally forgets to correct them, he develops an idea, adds examples and quotations, and sometimes new passages, clashing with others written years before which he forgets to erase, writes a continuation, a new book, a new part. The emendations or additions in the already written text are crammed into the margin or written on slips or fly-leaves. That this practice was in use in the Middle Ages, we might have surmised, as it is difficult to imagine any other; but we know in fact that it was so, as some few samples of manuscripts of this sort have come down to us; manuscripts in which "the author has made

corrections, additions, or suppressions, between the lines, on the margins, and sometimes on separate sheets or fragments of vellum inserted in the quire. It is not always easy to see where those modifications should come in."[1]

Great care has been, indeed, ever necessary to prevent mistakes in such cases; they have, in fact, scarcely ever been avoided. Glaring ones remain in works of this sort, of whatever epoch, and which we know to have been revised sometimes by the authors themselves, sometimes by their trustiest friends after their death, and at periods, too, when more attention was paid to correct texts and logical development than in the days of the Plantagenets.

A famous example of this way of rewriting a book is that of Montaigne, whose copy of his own essays, prepared in view of one last edition, is preserved at Bordeaux, the margins covered with scribbled additions,[2] other additions having certainly been inscribed on slips or fly-leaves (now lost), as they are to be found, not always at their proper place, in the undoubtedly authentic text published soon after Montaigne's death by those devoted friends and admirers of his, Pierre de Brach and Mlle de Gournay.

Superabundant proofs may be given that the author of *Piers Plowman* wrote his revisions in a similar way, handing, however, to less careful people (professional scribes) material requiring more care, with some slips, fly-leaves, afterthoughts, and marginal additions difficult to place at the proper spot. An original with all the leaves, sheets, and slips in good order or comparatively so would yield comparatively good copies; then, by some accident, leaves and slips would get mixed, and scribes would reproduce with perfect composure this jumble of incoherent patches, thus betraying the loose and scrappy state of the text before them, and their own obtuseness.[3] Tentative additions, written by the author

[1] Letter from Mr. Léopold Delisle to the author, Chantilly, August 3, 1908. An example of a MS with alterations in the primitive text effected by means of slips of vellum pasted on certain passages, is the MS Royal 14, c, vii, in the British Museum, containing the *Historia Anglorum* of Matthew Paris.

[2] A facsimile page accompanies P. Bonnefon's contribution to the *Histoire de la littérature française* of P. de Julleville, Vol. III, p. 466.

[3] A striking example is that offered by two important MSS of A, one at University College, Oxford, and the Rawlinson Poet. 137, at the Bodleian. Both were copied from the same original which offered a good text, but the leaves or slips wherewith it was made had got disarranged and had been put together in wrong order. Both scribes carefully reproduced

on the margin or on scraps, to be later definitively admitted or not into the text, were inserted haphazard anywhere by some copyists and let alone by others.[1] In his next revision the poet never failed to remove a number of errors left in the previous text, always, however, forgetting a few.

As shown by the condition of MSS, the poet let copyists transcribe his work at various moments, when it was in the making (it was indeed ever in the making), and was in a far from complete and perfect state; sometimes when part or the whole of an episode was lacking, or when it ended with a canto or passus merely sketched and left unfinished.[2] The scribes who copied the MS Harl. 875 and the Lincoln's Inn MS had apparently before them an original of version A, containing only the first eight passus, that is, the episodes of Meed and Piers. Almost all the other MSS of A have eleven passus and contain the story of Meed, Piers, and

the same jumble of incoherent parts. The University College MS "is regular down to passus II, 25, which is immediately followed (on the same page) by passus VII, 71–213, and then returns to l. 132 of passus I, the last four lines of passus I and some twenty lines of passus II occurring twice over. It then goes down to passus VII, 70, when the passage which had already occurred is omitted." In the other MS: "the text is in precisely the same wrong order," says Skeat in the Preface of A, pp. xx and 143* (Early Engl. Text Soc.). Other examples might be quoted. In the MS Cotton, Vespasian B, XVI, in the British Museum, containing a text of C, "written before 1400," and therefore contemporary with the author, passus XVIII was copied from separate sheets or scraps which had also got mixed, so that after XVIII, 186, comes XVIII, 288, "then comes XVIII, 187; then XVIII, 259–287; then XVIII, 188–258, after which comes XVIII, 289, and all the rest of the passus."—Skeat, Preface of C, p. xl.

[1] Of this sort are, to all appearances, the additional lines in the MS Harl. 875 of A, not to be found elsewhere, especially the two passages giving, as in a parenthesis, some supplementary touches, on Fals and on Favel, one of four and the other of three lines (II, 136, 141). In the MS of C, belonging to the Earl of Ilchester, a passage (X, 75–281, Skeat, Preface of C, p. xxxiv) is twice repeated with considerable differences, one of the two versions being, it seems, a first cast of the other. Finding both in the copy before him, the scribe quietly transcribed the two.

Another remarkable example is the one to which Professor Manly drew attention: The four or five lines added at the moment when Piers Plowman is about to make his will, and giving the names of his wife and children (A, VII, 70). They had obviously been written apart on the margin or on a slip, to be inserted later and be duly connected with the bulk of the text. The copyists inserted them as they were, at the place opposite which they found them, and so they form a crude and strange parenthesis. The scribes wrote them, however, precisely as a sort of parenthesis, which was showing more intelligence than in some other cases; the sign indicating a new paragraph usually precedes them; such is the case in the excellent MS Laud 581, fol. 27. The additional MS 35, 287, fol. 29*b*, not only has the same sign, but a blank precedes these lines, so as to show that they are really something apart.

[2] MS Rawlinson Poet. 38, in the Bodleian, is, as Mr. Skeat has pointed out (preface of B, p. xii, E. E. T. S.), a copy of the B text with some additions and afterthoughts (about one hundred and sixty lines in all), destined to be incorporated later, with a large quantity of others, in the C text. It represents, therefore, one more state in which the work was allowed by the author to be copied. It seems scarcely probable that an independent reviser should have revised so little and allowed the work to be copied after such slight changes.

part of Dowel. Two, however, give us a fragment, and a third, what purports to be the whole of a twelfth passus,[1] a mere sketch anyhow, almost entirely discarded in subsequent revisions. It does not in any case end the story of Dowel; much less does it give what the beginning of the episode had led us to expect concerning Dobet and Dobest. Of these two we were to hear only in the B and C texts, written later, which were also allowed to be copied before they were finished; they were, indeed, never finished at all. Both contain, besides the Meed and the Plowman episodes, seven passus on Dowel, four on Dobet, and only two on Dobest. That the author did not intend to end there is shown, not only because it does not really end (in allegorical matters, it is true, one may end almost anywhere), not only on account of the abnormal brevity of the Dobest part, but also because, in the Bodleian MS Laud 656 of the C text, one of the best and most trustworthy, after the conclusion of the second and last *de facto* passus on Dobest, occur the words: "Explicit passus secundus de dobest et incipit passus tercius." These words do not seem to have been added, as Mr. Skeat suggests, by mistake, but because the copyist read them in his original. That a continuation was really expected is shown by the blank pages left for it: the leaf on which this note appears, as well as the three following ones (somewhat damaged by somebody who wanted bits of vellum and cut off some strips), remain blank in the MS, and these leaves belong, as I have recently verified, to the quire on which the Visions are written, not to the work coming next in the book.

Works of the *Piers Plowman* type are rarely finished. The life of men who take their book for their confidant comes to an end before their book does. The English dreamer no more finished his *Piers Plowman* than Montaigne his *Essays*, or Rabelais his *Gargantua*. But while the author allowed incomplete texts to go about, there is no doubt that each successive episode was in

[1] The MS of version A at University College, Oxford, has 18 lines of this twelfth passus; the Ingilby MS has 88 lines and there stops short, the state of the MS showing, according to Skeat (*Parallel Extracts of 45 MSS;* Early Engl. Text Soc., p. 29), that the scribe had no more to copy. The MS Rawlinson Poet. 137, at the Bodleian, contains what purports to be the whole passus, but as, in this case also, the original MS did not supply a complete text, a man called John But, of whom more hereafter, took upon himself to add to it a sensational ending of his invention.

his mind when he laid down his pen after having finished the foregoing one, which shows sameness and continuity of purpose. For the two first, Meed and Piers, though more loosely connected than the rest, there can be no doubt, as they were written together in the same mood and style, and made public together; there is no copy where they appear separate. For the last episode, a tripartite one, dealing with Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest, the connection with the previous ones is established by the last part of the last passus (VIII) concerning Piers, where the author represents himself pondering about Dowel and the necessity of securing his help: pardons, Pope's bulls, triennals will be no good, "bote Dowel the helpe;" may we so behave, "er we gon hennes," that we may claim then, "we duden as he (Dowel) us hi3te."[1] That the Dowel episode would come next, if anything came, is thus made obvious; that it would be a tripartite one is shown from the beginning of this new part: (1) MSS of the A text have there such a heading as, "Incipit hic Dowel, Dobet, et Dobest," making clear what was the ultimate purpose of the author, though as a matter of fact Dowel alone, and only in part, was yet written; (2) The text itself of the first passus concerning Dowel also forecasts the treble account which was to be given only years later, in versions B and C, but was, even so early as 1362, in the author's mind. In the very first passus concerning Dowel (ninth of the whole work) Thought calls the dreamer's attention to those three beings, those three steps toward perfection:

> "Dowel," quod he, "and Dobet· and Dobest þe þridde
> Beoþ þreo faire vertues· and beoþ not fer to fynde."[2]

That these three versions of the *Piers Plowman* poem exist is certain; that they were written by someone cannot be considered a rash surmise. Of that one we know little; but that little is considerably better than nothing; better than in the case of more than one mediaeval work of value, *Morte d'Arthur*, for example, *Gawayne and the Green Knight*, or *Pearl*, in which cases we are reduced to mere suppositions.

For *Piers Plowman*, we have what the manuscripts tell us in their titles, colophons, or marginal notes; what the author tells us

[1] A, VIII, 187. [2] A, IX, 69.

himself in his verses; and what tradition has to say, being represented by one man at least whose testimony is of real weight.

Without exception, all those titles, colophons, marginal notes, and testimonies agree in pointing to the succession of visions, forming, at first, 8 or 12, and lastly 23 passus, as being one work, having for its general title *Piers Plowman*, and written by one author. MSS containing the three episodes of Meed, Piers Plowman properly so called, and Dowel, begin thus: "Hic incipit liber qui vocatur pers plowman;"[1] and end thus: "Explicit tractatus de perys plowman."[2] The continuity of the work is also shown by the numeration of the passus in several MSS; the MS Add. 35,287, for example, of text B, where we are told, at the end of the Piers Plowman episode, that the new passus now beginning is, at the same time, the first of Dowel and the eighth of the total work;[3] when we have had not only Dowel, but Dobet and Dobest, occurs then the colophon: "Explicit hic Dialogus petri plowman." The excellent MS Laud 581, also of text B, at the Bodleian, has the same way of counting the passus: "Passus octavus de visione et primus de dowel. . . . . Passus xvj^{us}, et primus de dobet."[4]

The manuscripts thus connect together the several parts of the poem, showing that one whole work, under the general title of *Piers Plowman*, is in question. In the same fashion, all the notes found on their leaves, the allusion in the work, and tradition, attribute the poem to one single author.

Some of these notes vary as to the name or the form of the name or surname; not one implies more than one author for the whole. At the end of the Piers Plowman episode properly so called, three MSS have the note: "Explicit visio Willelmi W. de petro Plowman. Et hic incipit visio *ejusdem* de Dowel."[5] Three MSS assert therefore, in express fashion, that Dowel and the rest are by the same author. The more probable name and surname

[1] MS Rawlinson Poet. 137, in the Bodleian, a text of A, the only one with John But's addition, dating from the beginning of the fifteenth century.

[2] MS Harl. 3954, ab. 1420 (Skeat), containing 11 passus, and being a mixture of the A and and B versions.

[3] Fol. 36. This MS, now in the British Museum, was formerly the MS Ashburnham CXXIX.

[4] Fol. 33*a* and 62*a*; same colophon: "Explicit hic dialogus petri plowman."

[5] (1) An early MS belonging to the Earl of Ilchester; (2) the MS Douce 104, in the Bodleian Library, dated 1427; (3) the MS Digby 102, same library, middle of fifteenth

for our author are William Langland (or Longlond). The name William occurs in a number of places and cannot be doubted: "Incipit visio Willelmi . . . . Explicit visió Willelmi. . . . . A lovely lady calde me by name—And seide, 'Wille, slepest thow?' . . . . "[1]

> "What art thow?" quath ich· "that my name knowest?"
> "That wost thow, Wille," quath he· "and no wight betere."[2]

The surname Langland (Longlond) is to be found in full in a punning line of the B text, the syllables being arranged in a reversed order:

> I have lyved in *londe*, quod I· My name is *longe Wille*.[3]

If we discarded the punning intention, the line would have little enough meaning: to "live in land" does not convey any very clear idea; so little indeed, that when revising his text for the third time, and choosing not to repeat his confidence, the author not only suppressed the "longe Wille," but also the "lived in londe," which left alone would have, to be sure, betrayed nothing, but would have been simply meaningless. He wrote:

> Ich have lived in London· meny longe ȝeres.[4]

That the line was of interest as giving the author's name was not noticed only by the critics of today; it drew attention from the first. In the margin of the MS Laud 581, opposite the before-

century, all three containing the C text. See Skeat's edition (E. E. T. S.) of C, pp. xxxvii, xlv, xlvi. The word represented by an initial (W.), an abbreviation habitually recalling the place of birth or origin, has been hypothetically, and with no certitude, interpreted as meaning "Wigorniensis" (Skeat) or "of Wychwood" (Pearson).

[1] C, II, 5. [2] C, XI, 71. [3] B, XV, 148.

[4] C, XVII, 286. To give one's name, or someone else's, in a more or less enigmatical fashion was quite customary in Langland's day. Mr. Skeat has been the first to show that when he spoke of the "the wikked Nest" (*Monk's Tale*), Chaucer meant Olivier de *Mauni*, whose name he simply translated. I have quoted the example of Christine de Pisan in my *Piers Plowman*. Another example is Gower, who wrote:

> Primos sume pedes Godefredi desque Johanni,
> Principiumque sui Wallia jungat eis
> Ter caput amittens det cetera membra.
> —*Vox Clamantis*, Prol. to Book I.

Langland seems to have considered that some inconvenience might result from his having said so much, and he suppressed in text C, as said above, his veiled confidence.

quoted verse, occur the words in fifteenth-century handwriting: "Nota the name of thauct[our]:"[1] The carefully written MS Additional 35,287, which has been revised by a contemporary corrector, supplies very important evidence. The rule followed in it is that Latin words or names of real personages are written in large letters and underlined in red, and the names of imaginary beings are not distinguished in any way from the rest of the text. Thus the names of Meed, Holy Church, Robert the Robber, etc., are written like any other word. But the names of Samson, Samuel, Seneca, Kings Edmund and Edward are underlined in red. The name of "Longe Wille" is underlined in red and written in larger letters than the rest of the line, thus taking rank in those of real and not of imaginary beings.

Various notes and more or less detailed statements inscribed on several MSS are to the same effect. In the MS Ashburnham CXXX appear, inside the cover, in a handwriting of the fifteenth century, the words, "Robert or William Langland made pers ploughman."[2] In the Dublin MS occurs the well-known statement, also written in the fifteenth century: "Memorandum quod Stacy de Rokayle, pater Willielmi de Langlond . . . . qui prædictus Willielmus fecit librum qui vocatur Perys Ploughman." John Bale, later, who took so much trouble, in the course of his "laboryouse journeys," to gather all available information concerning old English writers, inserted in his *Catalogue* a somewhat detailed notice which, if it contains some doubtful assertions (he himself states that several points are indeed doubtful), is certainly the result of personal investigations. He asserts once more that *Piers Plowman* is the work of one poet, called "Langland." Not content with printing his statement in his Latin *Catalogue*, he repeated it, in an abbreviated form, on the cover of one of the MSS he handled, namely the before-quoted Ashburnham MS CXXX of the B text: "Robertus Langlande, natus in comitatu Salopie in villa Mortimeris Clybery in the Clayland and within viij miles of Malvern hills, scripsit piers ploughman."[3]

[1] Fol. 64*a*.

[2] Skeat, B, Preface, p. xxii (E. E. T. S.).

[3] Skeat, A, Preface, p. xxxv (E. E. T. S.).

Unity of the work, condition of the MSS, allusions in the text or out of it, marginal notes, tradition concerning both work and author agree well together. From the first, the poem has been held to consist of a succession of visions forming one single poem, as the *Canterbury Tales*, composed of a succession of tales, are only one work; and to have been written by one single author, called William or Robert (in fact certainly William) Langland An attempt has recently been made to upset all that has been accepted thereon up to now.

II

During the last few years, Professor Manly has devoted his time and thoughts to *Piers Plowman*, not without notable effect. In two essays of great value he has made known the result of his studies and the inferences he thinks he can draw from what he has discovered.

His main and most interesting discovery, one which entitles him to the gratitude of every lover of mediaeval literature, consists in his having pointed out that a passage in the three versions had been misplaced in every MS and consequently in every edition, making complete nonsense where it was, while it would make sense elsewhere. Scribes, correctors, readers, editors, printers, and critics innumerable had seen the passage for five hundred years without noticing anything strange about it. Mr. Manly saw what nobody had seen, and the moment he spoke everybody agreed with him. Even if, in the end, the theories he thereupon put forth are not admitted, his merit will ever be that of the inventor; that of others, at best, the merit of the improver. There are several sorts of discoverers; Professor Manly belongs to the best and rarest, being one of those whose courtesy equals their learning and dialectical cleverness.

The discovery and theories of Professor Manly form the subject of two essays by him, one in *Modern Philology*, January, 1906, called "The Lost Leaf of Piers the Plowman," the other being the chapter on "Piers the Plowman and Its Sequence," in the *Cambridge History of English Literature*, Vol. II, 1908.

Combining what he had discovered with the impressions derived

from a careful reading of the three texts in succession, he came to the conclusion that *Piers Plowman* "is really the work of five different men," to the critics' imagination being due "the crea tion of a mythical author of all these poems."[1]

It may be, I think, in the interest of all to get rid at once of one of these five, and reduce the number to four. Even so reduced Professor Manly's theory, as will be seen, will prove hard enough to sustain. To admit John But to the honor of being one of the authors of the poem is indeed going too far. At the time when Richard II was "kyng of þis rewme," a copy of version A came to the hands of a silly scribbler who, as he says, "meddled of makyng." Finding the poem unfinished, and unaware of much more having been composed and made public since (for version B, at least, was then in existence), he added a senseless ending of his own, volunteering the information that Death had killed the author, now "closed under clom." He was so good as to give his name, so that we know for sure, on his own testimony, that "Johan But" was a fool.[2]

This spurious ending, preserved in only one MS and of which no trace is to be found in any of the continuations of the poem, no more entitles John But to the dignity of co-author, than do the lines added by scribes to make known their thirst, and their joy at having finished copying *Piers Plowman:*

> Now of þis litel book y have makyd an ende,
> Goddis blessyng mote he have þat drinke wil me sende.[3]

Let us therefore speak only of the four remaining authors, not an insignificant number, whose contribution to the total work is thus divided by Mr: Manly: Author I wrote passus I–VIII of A, containing the Meed and Piers Plowman episodes; Author II wrote the fragment on Dowel occurring in various MSS of A; to

[1] *Cambridge History*, II, p. 1.

[2] The passage on Death having killed the author seems to me, as to Professor Manly, to be the product of But's brain (so to speak). In his Oxford edition Mr. Skeat suppresses as spurious only the twelve last lines, from "And so bad Iohan But," etc., and in his E. E. T. S. edition he leaves a blank between these lines and the rest. As a matter of fact there is no blank in the MS, nor anything to distinguish these lines from what went before.

[3] MS Douce 323 (A text).

Author III are due the emendations and additions in text B; to Author IV the emendations and additions in text C.

Before studying the reasons alleged in support of this thesis, it may be observed that, to carry conviction, they must be very strong, not only because, as pointed out above, the spirit pervading *Piers Plowman* is not to be found anywhere else, and if four poets instead of one were imbued with it (the four being besides of great merit), it is singular that they all chose to manifest it by anonymous additions to the work of someone else, the same work in each case; not only because all testimonies and notes in the MSS contradict this theory; not only because, if the shadowy character of one author unseen, unmet by any contemporary, is strange, the same happening for four people concerned with the same problems would be a wonder; but also because to suppose four authors adding new parts to a poem and freely remodeling the old ones, is to suppose also that, as soon as Author I had finished writing, he would have died to leave room for Author II who, in his turn, must have written and died; as must have done Author III to make room for Author IV. If Author I, II, or III had survived, they would have protested against the intrusion; or, at least, one or several among them would have written a continuation of his own (the ever-unfinished poem certainly wanted one), so that if he had been unable to prevent interpolations or spurious continuations, he would have given his actual views. But we have no trace of such a thing. There are many manuscripts, yet they give us only one text for each continuation. This is the more remarkable as, if we admit of Professor Manly's own strictures, the intrusion of each successive author must have been very galling to the previous ones. Mr. Manly brings forth a number of proofs demonstrating, as he considers, that the work was actually spoilt in many places by these subsequent contributors, that Author II tried to imitate the style of Author I but failed; that Author III misunderstood, in a number of passages, the meaning of his forerunners, making nonsense of them all, and that Author IV did the same with Author III. No explanation is indeed possible, except that each of these authors must have written and breathed his last, with absolute punctuality, as moths lay their eggs, gasp,

and die.[1] A very strange, not to say improbable case. What are the proofs?

They are of three different sorts: (1) The shuffled leaf or misplaced passage; (2) Authors III and IV did not understand what their forerunners meant and must, therefore, be different people; (3) the differences of moods, feelings, ways of speaking, literary merit, meter, and dialect are such between the different parts or successive revisions, as to denote four different authors.

The main effort of Mr. Manly bearing on the demonstration that the author of version B cannot be the same as the author or authors of version A, and this discovery concerning the shifted passage being one of his most striking arguments, we shall consider this question first.

III

Having narrated, in the earliest version of the poem, the story of Meed, a story with no end to it, as is the case with all his stories, the author begins to tell his beads, and this, as a matter of course, he seems to imply, puts him to sleep:

> And so I blaberde on my beodes· þat brouhte me a-sleepe.[2]

He has a new vision, as slightly connected as can be with the foregoing one. Conscience delivers a sermon and Repentance advises sinners to repent. "William" himself repents first, dropping "watur with his eȝen;" then "Pernel proud-herte" does the same. Beginning with Pernel, who represents Pride, we have then a confession of the Seven Deadly Sins, sometimes personified by real beings, sometimes remaining sheer abstractions. Some of the portraits are drawn with admirable care and vividness; others are mere sketches so perfunctory and inadequate as to seem rather memoranda to be developed later and put there simply for the name to appear in the list. "Lechour," for example, whose misdeeds the author at other places, in the same version, is not loath to describe in language no less crude than picturesque, gets

[1] It may also be observed that if it frequently occurs that an author leaves a work of his unfinished, the case is rarer with a continuator; it is usually in view of completing what is unfinished that a continuator sets to work. It took time and space for Jean de Meung to finish the *Roman de la Rose*, but he finished it.

[2] A, V, 8.

only five lines—a simple memorandum to be improved afterward; as was indeed indispensable, for not only are details lacking, but the few that are given are scarcely appropriate. There is no confession at all; Lechour asks mercy for his "misdeeds," and promises that, for seven years, on Saturdays, he will have only one meal and will drink only water. If the privation he mentions is the only one he means to inflict on himself, it leaves him a margin for many sins, and especially his favorite one. Others, such as Envy (44 lines), Coveitise (39), and Gloton (76), are as full of life as the best passages in Chaucer himself.

Sloth, who comes last, has 14 lines, nearer the Lechour than the Gloton type; he is sorry for his nondescript "sunnes," and promises that, for seven years, he will not fail to hear mass and matins on Sundays, and no "ale after mete" will keep him from church in the evening, which, if admissible, is not strikingly fitting. This said, a continuation follows, the inappropriateness of which, after so many centuries, Mr. Manly was the first to point out.

Immediately after Sloth's solemn promise "to þe Rode," which, in the usual course, should conclude his speech, come twenty-four utterly irrelevant lines: "And ȝit," Sloth is supposed to continue saying:

> And ȝit I-chulle ȝelden aȝeyn· ȝif I so muche have
> Al þat I wickkedliche won· seþþe I wit hade, etc.[1]

The passage deals with the moral obligation for robbers and dishonest people to make restitution. A real being—such as others in the course of these confessions, like "Pernel proud-herte," or Gloton—Robert the Robber, is then introduced, weeping for his sins, wanting to make restitution, and in despair because he has not the wherewithal. These 24 verses are certainly out of place; some mistake of the scribe, to whom was due the original copy which all the others transcribed, must have caused the mischief, for all the MSS of A, without exception, offer this same inacceptable arrangement.

Here comes Mr. Manly's important deduction: this same unacceptable arrangement *was* accepted by the author of version B.

[1] A, V, 236.

He had certainly before him, when he set to work, a copy of A; and while he introduced in it innumerable alterations and additions, he left this passage at the same wrong place. He could never have failed to notice the mistake if he had really been the author of A; as he did not, he was not.

And there is more than that. The very way in which he tried to get out of difficulty shows that he was not the same man. He noticed that there was something unsatisfactory about the passage: what has Sloth to do with restitution? He also noticed the singular fact that, for some unexplained reason, in this confession of the Seven Deadly Sins, only six appear, Wrath being forgotten. What he did, thereupon, betrayed as much as anything else, according to Professor Manly, the dualism of authorship:

> The omission of Wrath and the confusion as to Sloth were noticed by B, and he treated them rather ingeniously. He introduced into the earlier part of Sloth's confession a declaration that he had been so slothful as to withhold the wages of his servants and to forget to return things he had borrowed. To supply a confession of Wrath, he himself wrote a *Confessio Irae*, totally different in style from the work of A, and, indeed, more appropriate for Envy than for Wrath, containing as it does no very distinctive traits of Wrath.[1]

These assertions, which we shall take up one by one, are supplemented by an explanation of what, in the opinion of Professor Manly, must have taken place. According to him, the author of the first part of A, the best-gifted and cleverest of all, cannot have forgotten Wrath and must have devoted to it a leaf which was accidentally lost; the same author must have put the passage concerning Robert the Robber where it actually stands; but, between the beginning of this passage and the end of Sloth, must have occurred, on a leaf also lost, lines serving as a transition from Sloth to Robert, lines numerous enough "for the development of the confession of Robert . . . . and also for the less abrupt ending of the confession of Sloth"[2]—an ending, it may be said, at once, not more abrupt than that of several of Sloth's fellow-sins. Very ingenious calculations, based on the average size of MSS and the number of lines in them, led Mr. Manly to the conclusion that those

[1] *Modern Philology*, Vol. III, p. 365. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 362.

two passages would correspond, and that the disappearance of one sheet in a quire of the original MS, that is, of the two half-sheets on which the two passages must have been written, is the proper explanation for the two gaps said to exist in the text.

This explanation seems to me absolutely untenable, and I entirely agree with Mr. Bradley who has pointed out[1] that no conceivable lost passage with lines making a transition from Sloth to Robert the Robber could be at all satisfactory. Those two people cannot possibly be grouped together; the category to which Robert belongs is, without possible doubt, Coveitise, who like him is bound to make restitution, and the proper place for the misplaced 24 lines is after Coveitise: A, V, 145. Mr. Bradley adds that such a statement rather confirms than weakens Mr. Manly's theory as to the difference of authors; not only B did not notice that the 24 lines were at the wrong place, but he had not the slightest idea what the right one was.

All these observations can easily be answered.

The author of B, the same I think as the author of A, issued, after a dozen years or more, a new text of his poem, a text which he had had more or less constantly beside him, making changes, corrections, and additions as it occurred to him, the usual way with authors of works of this sort, capable of extension. The copy he used was naturally a copy of A as there was no other text then in existence, with the 24 lines certainly at the wrong place, since he left them there. His changes, which transformed a poem of 2,579 lines into one of 7,241, were very numerous; sometimes slight ones were made, sometimes new quotations were added, sometimes new matter was introduced on a considerable scale: the very way another writer, Montaigne, also absorbed in his thoughts, actually worked. Preceded by some lines on the necessity of giving back ill-gotten goods ("And ȝit I-chulle ȝelden aȝeyn," etc.), the passage on Robert the Robber, a logical sequence to Coveitise, forms a separate incident, not at all necessary to make the confession of the Deadly Sins complete; it has all the appearances of an afterthought; such afterthoughts as the author, or anyone in his place, would write on separate slips left loose or which might get

[1] *Athenaeum*, April 21, 1906.

loose, and which Adam Scrivener of sleepy pen would copy anywhere. And as Scrivener, in the present case, did not know what to do, he put the stray lines at the end of the passus when the rest of the confessions were finished, so Robert would come just before the "þousent of men" who mourned for their sins, "weopyng and weylyng."

For what concerns the author himself, maybe, while making so many changes in so many places, he never paid any attention to this passage (in which, as a matter of fact, he introduced no change at all[1]); maybe also he thought of transferring it to its proper place and neglected to mark it accordingly or to see that the removal was made. The fact that the confession of Coveitise, as remodeled in version B, contains a passage, not in A, where restitution is insisted upon, at great length, in most pressing language, lends probability to this latter hypothesis. In version A the sins of this personage were told with some detail, but nothing except the vaguest allusion was made to necessary amends. In B, on the contrary, restitution is one of the points about which we hear most, the added passage being highly picturesque and in the author's best vein. Did you never make restitution? says Repentance—

> "ȝus, ones I was herberwed," quod he, "with an hep of chapmen,
> I roos whan thei were arest· and yrifled here males."
> "That was no restitucioun," quod Repentance· "but a robberes thefte . . . ."
> "I wende ryflynge were restitucioun," quod he· "for I lerned nevere rede on boke,
> And can no Frenche in feith· but of the ferthest ende of Norfolke."[2]

The restitution here alluded to is precisely that which a penitent thief should make, the question being of stolen goods. Much more clearly than the lines added in Sloth (the bearing of which

[1] Two lines, 248, 249, of A are omitted in B, a mere scribe's oversight and one, as Skeat has noticed (not at all in view of the present discussion), particularly difficult to avoid in copying alliterative verses. (Preface of A, 1867, p. xvi.)

[2] B, V, 232; and further on, Repentance reverts to the same subject:

> "Thow art an unkynde creature· I can the nouȝte assoile,
> Til thow make restitucioun· and rekne with hem alle,
> And sithen that resoun rolle it· in the regystre of hevene,
> That thow hast made uche man good· I may the nouȝte assoile;
> *Non dimittitur peccatum, donec restituitur ablatum.*" —B, V, 276.

will presently be examined), this addition looks like a preparation for the appearance, shortly after, of Robert the Robber, who, too, should make restitution, but has "nouȝte wher-of."

That nevertheless, owing to the author's omission or the scrivener's "negligence and rape," as Chaucer would say, the Robert and Restitution passage was left, as before, at the wrong place, has nothing very prodigious or extraordinary. There is not even any need to suggest (though it may have been the case) that the poet happened to be of a conspicuously careless nature. The most careful people may be at times absent-minded. As I was talking recently about the *Piers Plowman* problem with a writer, who feels greatly interested in it (as well as in a few other questions), whose works have had a wide circulation and have been scrutinized by critics, not all of them over-friendly, he mentioned that something of the sort had happened to himself. Opening, thereupon, at p. 13, the *Outdoor Pastimes of an American Hunter*, a work made up of several essays, written at different moments, with additions and afterthoughts noted on slips, he pointed out that two slips with the same statement had not only been allowed in by him, but the contents of the two were repeated in the same page, giving to the whole a, to say the least, somewhat ludicrous appearance:

> The bobcats are very fond of prairie dogs, and haunt the dog towns as soon as spring comes and the inhabitants emerge from their hibernation. . . . .
>
> Bobcats are very fond of lurking round prairie-dog towns as soon as the prairie dogs come out in spring. . . . .

Not only critics, friendly or otherwise, never noticed this strange occurrence, but the author himself read three proofs of the work, gave several editions of it, and has only just now had the mistake removed.

Stray sheets with corrections and afterthoughts on them are certainly difficult to handle and require a perseverance in attention which, without speaking of scribes, famous authors sometimes lack. To give only one more example, I may quote that of Cervantes who, as everyone knows, represents Sancho Panza quietly mounting his ass just after Gines de Passamonte had stolen it from him. The theft was an afterthought that Cervantes

forgot to make fit properly with the rest of his work. Having become aware of the mistake, he revised his text, but insufficiently, and left one or two passages in which Sancho is shown still riding the stolen animal. He made fun of it all later, in chaps. iii and iv of the second part of his immortal book; being no less merry about his mishap than the President of the United States about his own.

The same happened to Langland who, even supposing him to exhibit no conspicuous carelessness, was certainly not endowed with a strictly geometrical mind, and who, judging from results, continued to the last using slips, and loose sheets that were apt to go astray. Another proof, unnoticed till now, may be given from the C version. In this text the author has added, among other passages, some ten lines in the speech delivered by Piers Plowman before he makes his will:

Consaile nat the comune· the Kyng to displease;[1]

and do not, "my dere sone," hamper parliamentary, judicial, or municipal authorities in the fulfilling of their duties. These lines occur in C, after the text of parenthesis giving us the name of Piers's wife and children; they make no proper continuation, neither to this nor to what Piers was saying before, for he was saying that he would help all, except "Jack þe Jogelour" and "folke of that ordre." What "dere sone" is he now addressing? The passage thus inserted is so unsatisfactory that Mr. Skeat's marginal analysis ceases there,[2] as it is difficult indeed to make anything of it.

But the whole can easily be set right. In an earlier part of his same speech, Piers had been addressing especially the Knight, a good knight, full of the best will; he had recommended him to behave well, and to avoid dissolute people. To this advice in A and B, he added in C one line, as a link for his afterthought, viz., the line reading:

Contreplede nat conscience· ne holy kirke ryghtes.[3]

Owing to a slip going wrong or to some such mishap, the ten lines

[1] C, IX, 35.

[2] C text (E. E. T. S.), p. 143.

[3] C, IX, 53.

were not inserted here but elsewhere, making there perfect nonsense. Removed here, they fit in perfectly. Piers, continuing to address his "dere sone," says:

> Consaile nat the comune· the Kyng to displese,
> Ne hem that han lawes to loke. . . . .

Place these ten lines after the above, and all comes right: "Contreplede nat conscience . . . . consaile nat the comune," etc. When Piers has finished this review of a knight's duties (quite incomplete in the earlier versions), the old text is resumed and fits also perfectly, the Knight saying as before: "Ich assente by Seynt Gyle." Then comes also very appropriately Piers's declaration as to the disposition he has to make before his journey, and, as a last preparation, the drawing-up of his testament.

There can be no doubt that this arrangement is the right one and was intended by the author; no doubt either that this is one more case of an afterthought which the original copyist inserted at the wrong place, the author taking no notice; and as there was no further revision the mistake was never corrected.

With version B and the misplaced Robert and Restitution passage, the case was different; if Langland failed then to have the error corrected it was not so when, for the last time, he revised his whole work. To all appearances the revision was carried on in the same way as before, with a B text before him, erasures, corrections, and additions being made in the text, on the margins, or on slips. One of the author's most important corrections is (and this had been noticed before by critics) the new place in the text allotted by him to this same Robert and Restitution incident. That place is certainly the right one, the one Mr. Bradley suggests, and which the whole bearing of the passus imperiously commands. It comes after the confession and repentance of Coveitise.

One particular which has not been noticed deserves, however, special attention. The twenty-four lines consist, as we know, of six verses on the necessity of making restitution, followed by what concerns Robert the Robber; the six lines cannot be properly attached, such as they are, to any part of the poem, neither where they stand in A and B, nor where the confession of Coveitise

ends, which is their real place. Professor Manly supposes, as we have seen, a big gap supplying room enough for a transition from Sloth to Robert and Restitution. C, who being, as I think, the author, knew better, not only transferred the passage to the end of the confession of Coveitise, but supplied what was lacking to make it fit. What was lacking was not eighty lines as Mr. Manly would have us believe, but *one.*

Now, let anybody who has not the poem at his finger's ends try to imagine what single verse can make sense of that nonsense: we have our twenty-four lines, beginning, in the two texts where they are misplaced, with:

> And ȝit I-chulle ȝelden aȝeyn· ȝif I so muche have,[1]

and continuing with the passage telling us of Robert who "on *Reddite* he looked," and unable to repay, weeped full sore. What is that *Reddite* he looked upon, and how can the passage be made to form a complete and satisfactory whole? No such personage as *Reddite* has been mentioned. There is not even any mention of some scroll with that word on it. I submit that only the author who knew from the first what he meant, could supply the single necessary verse. Let anyone who thinks he has a chance, try his skill.

Here is, in the meantime, what Langland did. The single line he added makes it clear that his intention had been, not to introduce one real man (Robert), but two real men; the restored passage reads:

> Then was ther a Walishman· was wonderliche sory,
> He highte ȝyvan ȝeld aȝeyn·[2] ȝf ich so moche have,
> Al that ich wickeddelich wan· sytthen ich wit hadde,
> And þauh my liflode lacke· leten ich nelle,
> Þat ech man shal have hus· er ich hennes wende . . . .[3]
> Roberd þe ryfeler· on *reddite* lokede
> And for þer was nat wher-with· he wepte ful sore.
>
> —C, VII, 309.

[1] A, V, 236; B, V, 463.

[2] The scribe who first placed this same passage—minus the torn-off or somehow left-off first line—at the end of the passus in A, considered that he supplied a sufficient connection by simply changing, "He highte ȝyvan ȝeld aȝeyn," which, taken apart, made such nonsense as to strike even a scribe, into, "And ȝit I-chulle ȝelden aȝeyn."

[3] Mr. Skeat considers these and the following lines, six in all, as forming the name of the Welshman, a suggestion he offers somewhat dubiously, as he abstained in both his

Now we know, and it is not the least significant result of the introduction of this one line previously dropped by a careless copyist, now we know what was meant by Robert the Robber "on *Reddite* he looked;" he has at present someone to look upon, namely his fellow-thief turned penitent: Evan Yield-Again, otherwise Evan *Reddite*, both words being a translation one of the other. Mind, writes Dr. Furnivall, to whom I had submitted this argument, that Yield-Again is a man and *Reddite* a mere word. I mind very well, and draw from it one more argument that we have to do with a single author. For this is not an isolated case of a Latin word being transformed by Langland into a personage having its own part to play, and bearing an English name which is a mere translation of the Latin word. In passus VIII of A (B, VII, 110), at one of the most solemn moments in the whole poem, Piers unfolds his bull in which is written: "Qui bona egerunt ibunt ad vitam æternam." *Qui Bona egerunt* becomes at once Dowel, a separate personage who may help men or not, according to their merits, and the search for whom becomes the subject of the following passus. In the same connection may be quoted another example from a previous passus. In A, II, we hear that "Favel with feir speche" has brought together Fals and Meed. Some lines further on, "Feir speche" has become a steed which Favel rides to go to Westminster, and which is "ful feyntly a-tyred."[1]

But why, one may say, select, of all people, poor Evan as a typical thief, willing, it is true, to make restitution, but a thief none the less, and why produce him as a parallel to "Robert the

editions from hyphenating, as he does usually in such cases, the whole succession of words said to compose the colossal name. The hypothesis is not an impossible one as Welsh people were famous for the length of their names and Langland was fond of inventing such appellations. It seems more probable, however—MSS giving of course no indication—that the name is simply Evan Yield-Again, and that the rest is the speech by which he, quite appropriately, shows that he is really "wonderliche sory." It frequently occurs with our poet that the transition from the indirect to the direct speech is very abrupt, and it is not always easy to be quite sure where the talking begins. See, for example, the passage B, II, 146, where the author tells us of Favel distributing money to secure false-witnesses; it ends by a line which we must suppose to be pronounced by Favel himself. The money is given, we are told, to secure the good will of notaries,

And feffe False-witnes· with floreines ynowe;
"For he may Mede amaistrye· and maken at my wille."

Cf. C, III, 158, where Skeat hypothetically attributes a longer speech to Favel.

[1] A, II, 23, 140.

Robber," also a penitent thief, but a thief? With Robert the case is clear; the association of the two words, as Mr. Skeat, in his invaluable treasure of *Notes*, has well shown, was traditional: "Per *Robert, robber* designatur."[1] But what of Evan, "the Walishman"?

The name and the man fit the passage one as well as the other. Welshmen were proverbially taunted by their English neighbors with an inclination to thievery (and they, in true neighborly fashion, reciprocated the compliment). Their own compatriot, Giraldus Cambrensis, praises, in his *Description of Wales*, their quick intelligence, sobriety, hospitality, love of their country, but he has a chapter "Quod rapto vivunt," in the first phrase of which he explains that it is not for them a mere question of plundering their neighbors, but that they act likewise "among themselves."[2] The Parliamentary petitions show, on the other hand, that the complaints were ceaseless against Welshmen for their plunder and robberies; they "robbent et raunsenont et preignent bestes, biens et chateux;" the bordering shires are all spoilt and ruined ("degastez et destruz") owing to their misdeeds,[3] and, what is well worthy of remark, those shires whose names and complaints constantly recur in the series of petitions are, to take an example of the year 1376, the year of text B, "Wyrcestre, Salop, Stafford, Hereford, Bristut et Glouc'."[4] The first-named of these shires which want Welsh thieves to be punished and obliged to make restitution—for this too is mentioned in the petitions[5]—is Worcester, the very region where, on "Malverne hulles," it befell Langland "for to slepe for weyrynesse of wandryng." No wonder that the misdeeds of Evan the Welshman, and Robert

[1] Wright's *Political Songs*, p. 49, mentioned in Skeat's *Notes*, p. 125.

[2] "Ad hoc etiam rapinis insistere, raptoque vivere, furto et latrocinio, non solum ad exteros et hostiles populos, verum etiam inter se proprium habent."—*Descriptio Cambriæ . . . . Opera*, Brewer, Vol. VI, p. 207.

[3] 3 Ric. II, 1379–80, *Rolls of Parliament*. Such complaints are particularly numerous during the reign of Richard II.

[4] 50 Ed. III, *Rolls*, Vol. II, 352.

[5] In a petition of 2 H, IV, 1400–1, embodying wishes which certainly did not originate then, we find that, to the great detriment of the "countez ajoignantz à les marchies de Galys," Welshmen—"les gentz du Galys"—continued to steal "chivalx, jumentz, boefs, vaches, berbitz, porks, et altres lour bienz." The interested parties ask that these "meffesours" be ordered to make restitution, "lour facent deliverer lour distressez biens et chateux issint prisez et arrestez, saunz ascun dilaye."—*Rolls*, Vol. III, p. 474.

the Robber were linked together in his mind, and that he never had a good word for Welshmen.[1] Even this detail deserves to be noted, that in showing his two penitent thieves, the common robber who is willing to make restitution, but has not withal, and the other who is willing and able to a certain extent, the poet strictly adhered to realities. The Evanses of the border usually carried away sheep and cattle which they might have bodily restored in most cases if they had been truly "sory" for their misdeeds.

It will be admitted, I hope, that once more poem and real facts turn out to fit together quite well, and tally better with my plea than with Professor Manly's. Far from showing a diversity of authors, the study of the question of the shifted passage strongly confirms what other indications led us to believe, namely that the poet who wrote C must have written A also. Both, and consequently B, must be, so far as shown by the facts under consideration, the work of one and the same Langland.

IV

But with reference to the shifted passage, other points have been mentioned by Professor Manly, it will be remembered, as denoting a plurality of authorship. According to him the author of B, not knowing what he was about, tried, "rather ingeniously," to justify the presence of the Robert and Restitution passage after the confession of Sloth, and, in view of this, he introduced in the latter's speech a declaration that "he had been so slothful as to withhold the wages of his servants and to forget to return things he had borrowed."

The author of B, on the contrary, never dreamt, as I take it, of making any such attempt, and if he took any notice at all of the passage, it was to prepare its being removed to where it should appear, though he neglected to see that the change was effected. His additions in the confession of Sloth show, in any case, no intention to lead to the subject of Robert the Robber and of restitution.

[1] "Griffin the Walsche," in the three texts of the same passus where Yield-Again appears, is mentioned as one of the roisterous friends of Gloton (A, V, 167).

As Langland was, at various periods, revising his text, he now and then filled gaps, replaced perfunctory sketches by more finished portraits, and added, as in the case of Coveitise for example, some excellent details to pictures already very good. He did so as it occurred to him, without showing that thoroughness and regularity of design that would have been a matter of course with an independent reviser and continuator, and the *raison d'être* of his work. Anyone, I consider, assigning to himself the task of revising such a poem as the first version of *Piers Plowman*, would not have left Lechour with his five insignificant, not to say irrelevant, lines, which are even reduced to four in B. But an author caring so little for geometrical regularity as Langland did, could very well leave Lechour alone for the present, to remodel his portrait later, or not, as suited his fancy. So it is that only in C do we find a real confession of this sin, in twenty-six lines.

A striking proof of this ungeometrical disposition of mind in our author is supplied by the very question of the Deadly Sins, a disposition, not to say an infirmity, so peculiar as practically to corroborate our belief in the unity of authorship. Every critic has noticed that, in the series of sins depicted in A, passus V, Wrath is lacking. It has never been observed that in this vast poem dealing with the reformation of mankind, in which the Deadly Sins constantly recur to the author's mind, being specifically dealt with four times, out of those four lists only one is complete, as first given in any of the three versions. The order is never the same, which makes it easier for the writer to forget one or the other of the sins; on second thoughts he sometimes corrects his list, sometimes not. An independent reviser would scarcely have acted so.

In the "feffement" of Meed (A, II, 63), the Deadly Sins figure as Pride, Envy, Avarice, Gluttony, Lechery, Sloth—Wrath is lacking. In the corresponding passage of B and C the order is, as usual, modified: Lechery comes before Gluttony, but the absence of Wrath has been noticed, and we find now mentioned: "the erldome of envye and wratthe togideres."[1]

[1] B, II, 83; C, III, 88.

Wrath was certainly absent from Langland's mind when he wrote this version A, as in his next enumeration there of the Sins, that is, in passus V, when they all confess and repent, Wrath is again forgotten. The order is not the same as before, being as follows: Pride, Lechery, Envy, Avarice, Gluttony, Sloth.[1] Having noticed the lack of Wrath in the previous passage, Langland, when he revised his text, added him here too, in B. This addition is naturally preserved in the C revision, but the order of the series is once more modified. In B the order was Pride, Lechery, Envy, Wrath, Avarice, Gluttony, Sloth; in C we have Pride, Envy, Wrath, Lechery, Avarice, Gluttony, Sloth.

Farther on, in the B text, the Seven Deadly Sins appear again as forming spots on the coat of "Haukyn the Actyf man." This is the only complete list, and is as follows: Pride, Wrath, Envy, Lechery, Avarice (alias Coveitise), Gluttony, Sloth.[2]

Farther on again, the sins are enumerated as constituting the main dangers threatening the wealthy, and the list is: Pride, Wrath, Gluttony, Sloth, Avarice, Lechery, Sloth again, total seven; but Sloth is named twice and Envy is lacking.[3]

In C, the Haukyn passage is fused with the confessions; but the list of the dangers is preserved. It is not left just as it was, for C notices that, in B, Sloth was named twice; he suppresses the word, therefore, on the least important of the two occasions, and so we have: "hus glotonye and grete synne" (C, XVII, 77), instead of: "his glotonie and his grete scleuthe" (B, XIV, 234). But, in spite of his desire, thus made evident, to revise and improve, the author of C, afflicted with the same infirmity of mind as the author of A and B, does not observe that Envy is lacking; he none the less gravely repeats twice that he is dealing with the "sevene synnes þat þer ben" (XVII, 44), that he speaks "of the sevene synnes" (XVII, 61). As there was no further revision, this list remained definitively incomplete. Such peculiarities are indeed so peculiar as to be, in a way, the author's mark—his seal

[1] A, V, 45.

[2] B, XIII, 276.

[3] B, XIV, 215.

and signature.[1] It is most unlikely that any reviser would have failed to "find the concord of this discord."

Concerning the additions to Sloth, in version B, it is easy to show that, like those introduced, at the same time, by the author in the confession of several other sins, they have no object but to bring his description nearer to the generally accepted type. For what regards Sloth, commonly held to be the source and cause of so many other faults, the poet examines the whole life of the slothful man, mainly, in his eyes, the man who *neglects* his duties. This was not at all a strange or original notion, but a commonplace one in those days. The pleasure such a man takes in finding "an hare in a felde" does not, to be sure, correspond exactly to our idea of slothfulness, but it corresponds to Langland's, who shows his sinner neglecting, meanwhile, to make himself proficient in church Latin. Sloth also neglects to come to mass in time, to fulfil his vows, to perform his penances, to keep his own house well, to pay his servants, workmen, and creditors their due, to thank those who have been kind to him. He wastes quantities of "flesche and fissche," cheese, ale, etc. His life has ever been one of neglect:

I ran aboute in ȝouthe· and ȝaf me nouȝte to lerne.

There is no intimation that any of his misdeeds was committed with the intention of *winning* money; it was with him mere negligence; if the author of B had really introduced any of these additions in order to make the confession fit with the restitution passage, he would have expressed himself otherwise, or would have chosen another alliterating letter and another word than *wan* in the line:

[1] The following table shows the number and order of the Sins as given in the earliest version where they appear.

A, II	A, V	B, XIII	B, XIV	C, XVII
Pride	Pride	Pride	Pride	Pride
Envy	Lechery	Wrath	Wrath	Wrath
Avarice	Envy	Envy	Gluttony	Gluttony
Gluttony	Avarice	Lechery	Sloth	Avarice
Lechery	Gluttony	Avarice	Avarice	Lechery
Sloth	Sloth	Gluttony	Lechery	Sloth
		Sloth	Sloth again	
Wrath is lacking	Wrath is lacking		Envy is lacking	Envy is lacking

And ȝete wil I ȝelde aȝein· if I so moche have,
Al þat I wikkedly wan.[1]

In truth, as I said, Langland had no other intent, in remodeling this passage, than to bring his picture near to the accepted type, and so he did. We may see in Chaucer what was the importance of that sin so summarily dispatched, at first, in the Visions, and how it led people to the *neglect* of all their duties, the temporal ones as well as the spiritual:

Necligence is the norice [of all harme] . . . . This foule sinne Accidie is eek ful greet enemy to the lyflode of the body; for it ne hath no purveaunce agayn temporel necessitee; for it forsleweth and forsluggeth, and destroyeth alle goodes temporeles by reccheleesnesse . . . . Of [lachesse] comth poverte and destruccioun, bothe of spirituel and temporel thinges.[2]

In similar fashion the confession of Sloth, as it reads in text B of *Piers Plowman*, ends by an allusion to the state of beggary to which he has been reduced by his "foule sleuthe." Not a word in these additions implies that the author really considered that the Robert and Restitution passage should come next and that he ought to insert details leading up to it.

Dwelling on Wrath, forgotten in version A, and added in version B, Professor Manly thinks he detects a proof of a difference of authorship in the differences of merit and of style. The Wrath confession in B is, according to him, "totally different in style from the work of A, and indeed more appropriate for Envy than for Wrath, containing as it does no very distinctive traits of Wrath. The additions . . . . are confused, vague, and entirely lacking in the finer qualities of imagination, organization, and diction shown in all A's work. In A, each confession is sketched with inimitable vividness and brevity."[3]

The answer is: (1) An author is not bound, under pain of being cleft in twain, always to show the same merits, in every respect, on every occasion, at all times; (2) the confessions in A are not so good, and the additions in B are not so bad as Professor Manly makes them out. As a matter of fact, some of these additions are

[1] B, V, 463.

[2] *Parson's Tale—De Accidia*, §§ 53 ff.

[3] *Modern Philology*, Vol. III, p. 365; *Cambridge History*, II, p. 15.

excellent, and more than one of the cleverest and most humorous touches in the whole poem are to be found in them;[1] others are not so happy. The same may be said of the confessions as first drafted in A, some of which are excellent, and others far from good.

Thus it is that, in version A, supposed to be so perfect, Pride, represented by Pernel Proud-herte, concludes her speech by a promise to

> merci be-seche
> Of al that ichave i-had· envye in myn herte.[2]

As Mr. Manly said of the Wrath portrait in B, this is "indeed more appropriate for Envy" than for Pride, and this similarity in aptitude for confusion, if it has any bearing at all on the problem, can but confirm our belief in a unity of authorship. The same repenting Pernel undertakes, in version A, to reform: she will wear a hair smock,

> Forte fayten hire flesch· that frele was to synne.

This kind of penance and this allusion to flesh "frail to sin" would certainly fit another Sin better than Pride, as shown by the author of A himself who, in passus III, had had the words "heo is frele of hire flesch" applied to Meed in the same speech where she is described as being "as comuyn as þe cart-wei."[3] In this same A text, described as so far above the additions in B, repenting Lechour declares that his penance will consist in eating and drinking less than before on Saturdays; which is, if one may be permitted to say so, to "take it easy." While Professor Manly alleges that the attributes of Wrath in text B would better suit Envy, it turns out that in A, inversely, one of the classical

[1] Important additions were introduced in the confession of Coveitise. Repentance obliges the sinner to examine his conscience (a passage has been quoted above, p. 18), and tell of his various misdeeds among chapmen, lords, Lombards, etc. Repentance goes on saying:

> "Hastow pite on þore men· þat mote nedes borwe?"
> "I have as moche pite of pore men· as pedlere hath of cattes,
> Þat wolde kille hem, yf he cacche hem myȝte· for coveitise of here skynnes."
> —B, V, 257.

All the passage is as vivid, sharp, and pregnant as any anywhere in version A.

[2] A, V, 52.

[3] A, III, 117, 127.

attributes of Wrath, the sowing of feuds and quarrels, is bestowed on Envy, who says of his neighbor:

> Bitwene him and his meyne· ichave i-mad wraththe,
> Bothe his lyf and his leome· was lost thorw my tonge.[1]

If this sort of confusion between Wrath and Envy proved anything, it would again prove unity of authorship, as we find it in both A and B. It proves nothing in reality, except that Langland was of his time, and that he was of it as well when he wrote B as when he wrote A. In all mediaeval accounts of the Deadly Sins, the descriptions constantly overlap each other, one of the most remarkable cases being precisely that of Wrath and Envy; the one was held to be the source of the other: "Envye," says Wyclif, "is modir of ire."[2] "After Envye," says Chaucer's Parson, "wol I descryven the sinne of Ire. For soothly, who-so hath envye upon his neighebor, anon he wole comunly finde him a matere of wratthe, in worde or in dede, agayns him to whom he hath envye." So begins Chaucer's chapter on Wrath in the *Parson's Tale*. Well might Langland include Wrath and Envy in a single "erledome," when revising his first text.

In that description of Wrath so unsatisfactory to Professor Manly, and added to text B, this sin is shown "with two whyte eyen, and nyvelynge (sniveling) with the nose." He goes about sowing discord, making friars and members of the secular clergy hate each other, scattering scandal and jangles in convents (not an insignificant sin this one, according to our author, who had said before, in version A, "Japers and jangelers, Judas children"), behaving so that people meant to live in peace,

> Hadde þei had knyves, bi Cryst· her eyther had killed other.[3]

All this is considered by Professor Manly so preposterous that the author of A could never have written anything like it; if the author of B did, he must have been a different man. But, as we have just seen, the author of A was not at all incapable of admit-

[1] A, V, 80. Cf. Chaucer, who, however, is careful to place his statement under *Ire:* "For soothly, almost al the harm that any man dooth to his neighebore comth of wratthe." —*Parsons Tale*, § 34.

[2] *On the Seven Deadly Sins*, chap. xii.

[3] B, V, 165.

ting irrelevant matter into his text, and on the other hand, there was nothing preposterous in these additions; they were, on the contrary, commonplace; such characteristics are paid full attention to by Chaucer's Parson: "Now comth the sinne of hem that sowen or maken discord amonges folk, which is a sinne that Crist hateth outrely." Jangling is another characteristic of Wrath: "Now comth Janglinge . . . . [and] comth the sinne of Japeres . . . . The vileyns wordes and knakkes of Japeris [conforten] hem that travaillen in the service of the devel."[1]

This same chapter on Ire well shows how vague were the limits assigned then to each sin. Following accepted manuals, and not considering there was any reason for him to make changes, Chaucer speaks, as coming under the scope of Ire, of those who "treten unreverently the sacrement of the auter," of swearing, of the various sinful ways of bringing about miscarriages, of "adjuracioun, conjuracion," charms and the like, of "Flateringe" unexpectedly associated with Wrath: "I rekene flaterye in the vyces of Ire, for ofte tyme, if o man be wrooth with another, thanne wol he flatere som wight to sustene him in his querele." Here is a good occasion for anyone who remembers in what style the rest of the *Canterbury Tales* were written to show that England rejoiced not only in several Langlands but in a large number of Chaucers.

V

Other arguments yet have been put forth in order to show that the author of version B could not have been the author of version A; very telling ones if they held good. Remodeling version A, the author of B is said to have misunderstood or spoilt several passages in it, and he cannot therefore have originally composed that version. The following examples are given, being doubtless the best available ones.[2]

—"In II, 21 ff. Lewte is introduced as the leman of lady Holy Church and spoken of as feminine." Allusion is here made by

[1] *Sequitur de Ira*, §§ 45, 47.

[2] *Cambridge History*, II, p. 32.

Professor Manly to the lines in B where the handsome lady "purfiled with pelure" tells the dreamer that Meed has

> . . . . ylakked my lemman· þat lewte is hoten
> And bilowen hire to lordes· þat lawes han to kepe.

The answer is: (1) There cannot be any question here of B having misunderstood A, as the passage is quite different in both texts, and there is no mention at all of Lewte in A. (2) "Lemman" does not necessarily mean a man and a paramour; to use it otherwise is not to commit any error; a leman is a tenderly loved being of any sex: Spenser's Proteus asks Florimel "to be his leman and his ladie trew." If Florimel could play the part of a leman, why not Lewte? And, as the pelure purfiled lady in the Visions was Holy Church, we may take it for granted that a difference of sex had little to do in her choice of a "lemman." (3) Very possibly there may be nothing more in the passage than a scribe's error, "hire" being put in instead of "hym;" the more probable as the correction is made in C:

> And lackyd hym to lordes· that lawes han to kepe.[1]

Of B having failed to understand or of having committed any error, there is no trace.

—"In II, 25, False instead of Wrong is father of Meed, but is made to marry her later." It is a fact that we have in A, "Wrong was hir syre," and in B, "Fals was hire fader," also that in B, as in all the other versions, Meed none the less marries Fals.

Without any doubt, when writing B, the author decided to modify entirely the family connections of Meed, and not without good cause. In the first version, so highly praised, the incoherency was such as to make a change indispensable. Wrong was very badly chosen as a father for Meed, and was given, besides, nothing to do. The marriage was not arranged by him; the marriage portion was not supplied by him; in the journey to Westminster he was forgotten; his part was limited to signing first among many others, the "feffment" charter supplied by other people. And while he did nothing in this important occurrence when, as

[1] C, III, 21.

a father, he should have been most busy, he suddenly reappeared in the next passus (as a murderer and a thief); he was then full of activity. Together with Peace, Wit, Wisdom, etc., Meed took part in the scene, but her blood-relationship with Wrong had been entirely forgotten and not a word was said implying any connection between the two: incoherency was there absolute. Wrong, moreover, was too thoroughly an objectionable father for Meed. From Wrong nothing but wrong can come; and yet, in this same text A, no less a personage than Theology assures us that Meed is not so bad after all. She is of gentle blood, "a mayden ful gent; heo mihte cusse þe Kyng for cosyn . . . ." How so, if the daughter of Wrong? In the same version, on the other hand, Favel does everything, and acts as the real father; it is he who assumes the responsibility and the charges of the marriage; he who supplies money to secure false witnesses at Westminster, who rejoices with Fals at the prospective success of the lawsuit. It is between him and Fals—Wrong being forgotten—that Meed rides to London.

The obvious thing to do in case of a revision was to suppress Wrong in the marriage preliminaries, and give Meed a less opprobrious parentage. Favel, not so repulsive as Wrong, was a ready-found father, the part of whom he had in fact already been playing. Such are precisely the changes adopted by Langland when rewriting his poem. That Fals instead of Favel appears in the half-line quoted above, owing to an obvious mistake as Meed marries Fals immediately after, is of no importance. Such slips of the pen would be difficult for any copyist, and even for any author, to avoid, in such a passage as this, with so many lines alliterating in *f*, and Favel fair speech, and Fals fickle tongue, constantly succeeding one another.

This is not a mere surmise, put forth for the sake of argument; it is a demonstrable fact. The same confusion between these two names, the same use of the one instead of the other, do not occur only in text B, but also in text C, and also in text A itself: one more kind of mistake which, if it demonstrates anything, can only show a similitude of authorship. In version A, II, the feoffment is said, on l. 58, to be made by Fals, and three lines farther on by Favel; Fals is a mistake for Favel. In version C, we are told,

in passus III, l. 25, that "Favel was hure fader," and on l. 121, that "Fals were hure fader."

The intention to make it Favel throughout, in B as well as C, is, however, certain: Fals in these texts continues to be the prospective husband and therefore cannot be the father; Wrong is no longer mentioned in either, so that there is only left Favel, correctly mentioned as such in C, III, 25. The same intention to give Meed a different parentage, better justifying Theology's otherwise ludicrous remarks, is also shown by Langland adding in B a mention that Meed had "Amendes" for her mother, a virtuous character, and the point is further insisted on in C: Meed's marriage cannot be valid without her mother's consent—

> Amendes was hure moder· by trewe mennes lokyng;
> Without hure moder Amendes· Mede may noght be wedded.[1]

The author of B has certainly neither "misunderstood" nor spoilt A in this passage; just the reverse; he made sense of what was very near being nonsense.

—"In II, 74 ff., B does not understand that the feoffment covers precisely the provinces of the Seven Deadly Sins, and by elaborating the passage spoils the unity of intention."

That B, on the contrary, understood perfectly that the Seven Deadly Sins were in question is shown by the fact that he took notice of only six appearing in A at this place, and that he added the seventh. He gives some supplementary details on each of the sinful "erledomes" or "lordeships" bestowed on the couple, the "chastlets" and "countes" these territories include. The unity of intention is in no way impaired.

—"In II, 176, B has forgotten that the bishops are to accompany Meed to Westminster and represents them as borne 'abrode in visytynge.'"

The answer is (1) B had no chance to *forget* any such thing, as he was, without any doubt, working with a text of A at his elbow. When he wrote his l. 176, he had before him l. 151 in A. (2) Contrary to what Professor Manly suggests, there is here no incoherency chargeable to B. In A, exactly as in

[1] C, III, 122.

B, Langland indulges in an incidental fling at bishops; no more in one case than in the other were they to go to Westminster at all. In A, Civil gives advice how each steed should be "dight;" deans and subdeans will be used "as desterers,"

For thei schullen beren bisschops· and bringen hem to reste;

which may mean anything one pleases, except the implying of a tumultuous journey to Westminster or anywhere else. Of Westminster not a word; and when, in version A, we reach that place with Fals and his crew, nothing is said of any bishop being part of the troop. In B, we have the same speech of Civil, with a few more details: deans and subdeans will be saddled with silver,

To bere bischopes aboute· abrode in visytynge.

As this fling at bishops had, in both texts, nothing to do with the story, the author, revising his poem for the last time, suppressed it entirely in text C, a not isolated example of good taste given then by him.

—"Worst of all, perhaps, B did not notice" the shifted passage on Robert and Restitution, and the introduction into the text of the names of the wife and children of Piers, at a place (A, VII, 71–74) where they interrupt Piers's speech before his journey.

This has been answered before.

VI

Professor Manly, it will be remembered, holds that the Visions were written by five different men; version A being the work of three, versions B and C of one each. We have discussed his theories concerning John But and the author of B, this last being the one about whom he took most pains. Besides the arguments enumerated above, he put forth some more concerning this same version; but as they apply also to the differences of authorship said to be discernible in the rest of the work, all these can be discussed together.

These arguments are drawn from differences in literary merit, in opinions, meter, and dialect noticeable in the successive versions of *Piers Plowman*. Those differences are, according to

Mr. Manly, so considerable that it is impossible to explain them "as due to such changes as might occur in any man's mental qualities and views of life in the course of thirty or thirty-five years, the interval between the earliest and latest versions."[1] In other words, all successive versions of any given work, or any separate part therein, showing such differences as we find in *Piers Plowman*, are proved by experience to be due to different authors; therefore the two parts of A (we exclude John But and his few lines) and the versions B and C are, in spite of the indications to the contrary supplied by MSS, and of all corroborating evidence, the work of four separate authors.

It is easy to show that this is not, in any way, a telling argument. Not only have the differences between the various versions of our poem been, as I think, greatly exaggerated, but, taking them at Professor Manly's own estimation, they would prove, in themselves, nothing at all, for a large number of works of every date and from every country can be quoted offering even deeper differences, and differences often occurring in a much shorter space of time; and yet the whole is indisputably the work of one single author, who had simply changed his mind, or his manner, or both, or was better inspired at one time than at another.

The differences in meter and dialect need not detain us much. They are mentioned "pour mémoire," rather than discussed by Mr. Manly, and we must wait till the case is put forth with an attempt at demonstration. We do not think that, when it is, it will prove at all a difference of authorship. Concerning dialects, it is very difficult to distinguish, in cases like this, what is attributable to the author and what to the scribe. Mr. Manly tells us that a careful study of the MSS would show that, "between A, B, and C, there exist dialectal differences incompatible with the supposition of a single author. This can easily be tested in the case of the pronouns and the verb *are*" (p. 34). But we find as great differences between the various copies of the *same* version; and shall we have to believe that each copy was the work of a different poet? Take a pronoun, as Mr. Manly suggests; we shall find, for example, that in one MS of version C, the pronoun *she* appears

[1] *Cambridge History*, II, p. 4.

as *ȝo*, in another MS of the same version as *hue*, in another as *sche* and *scheo*.[1] Yet the first two MSS not only give the same version, but belong to the same subclass and are very closely connected; dialectal forms are none the less markedly different.[2] The excellent Vernon MS of A has southern forms which do not appear in other MSS of the same version. The MS 79 at Oriel College, containing text B, is pure Midland; the MS of the same text, Dd. 1. 17, at the University Library, Cambridge, offers northern forms.

Metrical differences tell even less, not only because, here again, scribes may have had something to do with them (we have, for example, a MS of A whose scribe was so fond of alliteration that he often modified the text to add, against all rule, a fourth alliterating word[3]), but because, if we admitted that changes of this sort proved differences of authorship, we would have to admit that two different Miltons wrote *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained*,[4] and that 37 different Shakespeares wrote Shakespeare's 37 plays. "Let us first take the point of metre," says Dr. Furnivall in his just-published *Life* of the great dramatist, "in which Shakspere was changing almost play by play, during his whole life."[5] Prof. Manly states that, between the two parts of A, admitted by all critics to have been written at some years' distance in time, there are notable differences "in regard to run-on lines and masculine endings."[6] This would show that the *Tempest* cannot be from the same Shakespeare as *Love's Labour's Lost*, since there is one run-on line for every three in the first, and one for every eighteen in the second, and there are 1,028 riming lines in

[1] MSS Laud, 656, Bodleian; Phillipps, 8, 231; University Library, Cambridge, Ff. 5. 35.

[2] A striking example of the close connection between these two MSS of the same version, and also of the persistence of scribes in adhering to their own private dialectal forms, is given by Skeat, Preface of C, p. xxix (Early Engl. Text Soc.): the scribe of the Phillipps MS having written once by mistake *hue* instead of *he*, the scribe of the Laud MS "actually followed suit by substituting his favorite form *ȝo*, not noticing that *hue* was wrong."

[3] MS of Lincoln's Inn, version A; Skeat, Preface of A, p. xxii.

[4] "The difference in kind between the two poems is signalised in certain differences in the language and versification."—D. Masson, *Milton's Poetical Works*, Introduction to *Paradise Regained*.

[5] Furnivall and Munro, *Shakespeare's Life and Work*, 1908, p. 66. Cf. pp. 90, 114, 137, 147, and the tables, p. 263.

[6] *Cambridge History*, II, p. 18.

Love's Labour's Lost, and only two in the *Tempest* (and none in *Winter's Tale*).

Concerning differences of literary merit and mental power, Prof. Manly declares that the first part of A (episodes of Meed and Piers) is the best in the whole work; and not only the best, for after all it must happen to any author that one of his poems or cantos is his best, but so far above all the rest as to imply a difference of authorship. Those first eight passus are remarkable, he says, for their "clearness and definiteness and structural excellence;" they are conspicuous for their "unity of structure;" the writer never "forgets for a moment the relation of any incident to his whole plan. . . . . Only once or twice does he interrupt his narrative to express his own views or feelings. . . . . There is nowhere even the least hint of any personal animosity against any class of men as a class." The style is of unparalleled "picturesqueness and verve;" the art of composition is "one of the most striking features," of this portion of the poem.[1]

In the latter part of A, on the contrary, that is the Dowel passus, and in the additions introduced into versions B and C, those qualities disappear to a large extent; we have much more "debate and disquisition" than "vitalised allegory" (why not?); the author is interested in casuistry, in theological problems, predestination, etc. (again, why not?); the "clearness of phrasing, the orderliness and consecutiveness of thought . . . . are entirely lacking."[2] The author of B has the same defects to an even more marked degree; he is incapable of "consecutive thinking;" his "point of view is frequently and suddenly and unexpectedly shifted; topics alien to the main theme intrude because of the use of a suggestive word;"[3] he, too, shows interest in predestination (which in any case brings him near one of the supposed authors of A); he cannot follow his plan properly.

As a matter of fact, there are no such wide differences. Great as are the merits of the first part of A, written with all the vigor and vivacity of younger manhood, they are mixed with the very kind of faults Mr. Manly detects in the second part and in the successive versions. Incoherencies are numerous and glaring; the

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 1, 5, 11, 12. [2] Pp. 17, 18. [3] P. 24.

aptitude to start off on a new track because a mere word has evoked a new thought in the writer's mind is remarkable, and in this we can find once more his seal and signature, the proof of his authorship. None of the stories lead to anything, to anywhere, nor are in any way concluded.

Let us glance, as we are bidden, at the first part of version A, beginning with passus I. The dreamer asks a "lovely ladi," who turns out to be Holy Church, to interpret the dream of the two castles and the field full of folk, which he has had in the prologue. The Lady answers in substance: The tower on this toft is the place of abode of Truth, or God the father; but do not get drunk. Why drunk, and why those details about drunkenness that has caused Lot's sins, the nature of which is recalled? The word *drink* having come under the pen of the author, he started off on this subject and made it the principal topic (eight lines) in Holy Church's answer, though it had nothing to do with the dream she had been requested to interpret.

The dreamer thanks her very much, and asks now what is this money that these men are treasuring up and "so fast holden." The Lady makes a somewhat rambling answer, both question and answer being equally unexpected and irrelevant. The "feld ful of folk" in the prologue had been represented as filled with men who ploughed the land, prayed, glosed on the gospel, overfed themselves, pleaded before the courts, traded, did, in fact, all sorts of things, except hold fast "moneye on þis molde."

What the Lady should have explained was not hard to make clear. The subject of the dream in the prologue was nothing else than what the author must have seen in reality a number of times, namely, the world as represented in a mystery play, just as we may see it pictured in the MS of the Valenciennes Passion:[1] on one side, God's Tower or Palace; on the opposite side, the devil's castle, "þat dungen . . . . þat dredful is of siht," says Langland; between the two, a vast space for the various scenes in man's life or in the story of his salvation. It is simple, but the Lady loses her way, and the only people she describes are those that just happen not to have been there.

[1] Reproduced, e. g., in my *Shakespeare in France*, p. 63.

Asked by the dreamer, who has apparently ceased to care about the people in his dream, how he could be saved, the Lady advises him to think only of Truth; clerks "scholde techen" what Truth is. But this word *scholde* has caused the author's mind to wander, and instead of enlightening her hearer on his duties, the Lady begins to describe what other sorts of people "should" do, and especially a sort very far removed from the dreamer's condition, namely kings and knights; the Lady informs us that they "scholde kepen hem bi Reson." Kings in general remind her of King David in particular, and David and his knights remind her of Crist, who is the king of heaven, and of angels who are his knights; we have therefore something about angels, some of whom are good and others are bad, as witness Lucifer about whom we now get various details.

The poem continues as it began; the experience might be prolonged indefinitely. The dreamer insisting to know what is Truth, the Lady says that it consists in loving God more than oneself, but the word *love* having evoked a new train of thoughts, the poet descants now on the necessity of having "reuþe on þe pore;" if you do not "love þe pore" you cannot be saved, even if you have been as chaste as a child; but the word *chaste* starting a new idea, the author branches off on this topic: to be chaste is not enough; "moni chapeleyns ben chast," yet lack charity, and so on.

None of the visions, episodes, or stories in these passus have any ending, nor are continued by what comes next. After the field full of folk, interpreted in the way we have seen by Holy Church, after the dreamer's appeal to know how he can be saved, we have the story of Meed and of her intended nuptials with Fals. A question of the dreamer how to know "the Fals," of which Fals not a word had been said before, is all there is of "structural excellence" in the connecting of the two episodes. Theology objects to Meed's marriage; the case is brought before the King who wants to give her hand to the Knight Conscience. Conscience refuses, makes a speech, and consents at last to kiss Meed, provided Reason agrees he should. Reason is brought forth, makes a speech on quite different topics, and we never hear any more of the kiss or the marriage. "Þene Pees com to parlement;" a new episode

begins, the word "þene" being all that connects it with the previous one. And so on, till the end.

Worthy of the profoundest admiration as Langland is, he deserves it for qualities quite different from that "structural excellence" which Professor Manly thinks he discovers in version A and in no other. In this version, in version B, and in version C—the same combination of qualities and defects denoting the same man—the poet's mind is frequently rambling and his poem recalls rather the mists on "Malverne hulles" than the straight lines of the gardens at Versailles.

Another difference mentioned by Professor Manly is that only "once or twice" the author of the first part of A interrupts his narrative to express his own views. Here again the difference with the other versions is remarkably exaggerated. We find in A, such passages as those beginning: "Bote god to alle good folk . . . ." III, 55;[1] "Bote Salamon þe Sage . . . ." III, 84 (the author interferes in these two cases to give the lie to his own personages); "I warne ȝou, alle werk-men . . . ." VII, 306; "ȝe Legistres and Lawyers . . . ." VIII, 62; "For-thi I rede ȝow renkes (creatures) . . . . And nomeliche, ȝe Meires. . . . ." VIII, 168. Here are, in any case, five examples instead of "one or two." The Langland who wrote A resembled too much, in reality, the Langland who wrote B and C to be able to resist the temptation to interfere, interrupt, and make direct appeals to his compatriots—to you mayors, you lords, you workmen—whom he wanted so much to convert. All these Langlands, so strangely similar, cared little for art, as compared with moral improvement.

We have been told also that there is nowhere in A "even the least hint of any personal animosity against any class of men as a

[1] The intervention of the author in this case interrupts the story of Meed who has just been heard by her confessor, and has been promised absolution if she gives a glass window to the church. The author expresses his personal indignation at such doings, and beseeches "you, lordynges," not to act thus; lords make him think of mayors, and the word mayor recalls to him the duties of such dignitaries; in his usual rambling fashion, the poet passes on accordingly to the duty for mayors to punish "on pillories" untrustworthy "Brewesters, Bakers, Bochers and Cookes;" and when we return at last to Meed, as the author had just been speaking of mayors, he makes her address "þe meir," though none had been mentioned, and there was none there before. Here again there is no cause for praising A's "structural excellence."

class." In this, too, I must confess I do not see great differences between any of the Visions; the same deep antipathies appear in A as elsewhere: scorn for idle people of whatever sort, strong animosity against lawyers carried to the point of absolute unfairness,[1] contempt for pardoners, pilgrims, and all those who think that, by performing rites, they can be saved, scorn and disgust for friars, who are constantly mentioned with contumely, and certainly not as individuals but as a class; the whole lot of them ("all þe foure ordres," the poet is careful to say) are, like the lawyers, condemned wholesale.[2]

If the merits of the first part of A have been, as I consider, exaggerated, so have the demerits of the second part and of the two revisions. The second part of A has, it is true, more dull places than the first: no author is constantly equal to his best work. But even in this portion of the poem, we find passages of admirable beauty, such as Langland alone produced in these days; the one, for example, where he tells us of his doubts, and of his anguish at his inability to reconcile the teachings of the Church with his idea of justice. Aristotle—"who wrouȝte betere?"—is held to be damned; and Mary Magdalen—"who miȝte do wers?"—as well as the penitent thief, with his whole life of sin behind him, are saved. Happy those who do not try to know so much, who do not feel those torments; happy the "pore peple, as plouȝmen" who can (and what a grand line!)—

> Percen with a *pater-noster* the paleis of hevene.[3]

The value of the most picturesque and humorsome scenes in the rest of the poem fades in comparison with passages of this

[1] The author cannot admit that a lawyer's work deserves a salary as well as any other kind of work; he would like them to plead "for love of ur Lord," and not for "pons and poundes" (Prol. 85).

[2]
> I font þere Freres· all þe Foure Ordres,
> Prechinge þe peple· for profyt of heore wombes.
> —A, Prol. 55.

Friars receive Fals; they open their house to Lyer and keep "him as a Frere" (II, 206); Meed's confessor who is a model of low rascality is "i-copet as a Frere" (III, 36); Envy wears the "fore slevys" of "a Freris frokke" (V, 64, etc.). The fact that a copy of *Piers Plowman* belonged to a friars' convent has no bearing on the question; Wyclifite Bibles were also found in convents.

[3] A, end of passus X.

sort. Others, of a different stamp, might be quoted, such as the brief and striking portrait of Wit, the model man of learning:

> He was long and lene· to loken on ful symple,
> Was no pride on his apparail· ne no povert noþer,
> Sad of his semblaunt· and of softe speche.[1]

What has been said of the differences between the two parts of A cannot but be emphatically repeated for what concerns those supposed to exist between A and B. Given the time elapsed, as shown by the political allusions, those differences, if any there be, are far from striking. A remarkable point deserves attention at the start. As acknowledged by Professor Manly himself, the author of B makes excellent, vivid, and picturesque additions to the first two episodes (stories of Meed and of Piers Plowman), and introduces abstract, discursive, and scarcely coherent ones in the Dowel part; in other words B is, from this point of view, an exact counterpart of A, the picture being simply drawn on a larger scale. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that men so similarly impressed and influenced by similar topics were not improbably the same man.

In reality, defects and qualities bring the three versions very near one another. Professor Manly tells us that the author of B is in "helpless subjection to the suggestions of the words he happens to use;" so is, as we have seen, the author of A. The author of B "loses sight of the plan of the work;" so does A. B, Mr. Manly continues, shows perhaps as much power as A in "visualising detail;" but he is "incapable of visualising a group or of keeping his view steady enough to imagine and depict a developing action."[2] One may be permitted to ask what is the crowd which B ought to have described, and which he failed to visualise? Of the perfection of his power of observation and the picturesqueness of his style some examples have been given; many others might be added; and the famous rat-parliament, one of the most characteristic and best "visualised" scenes in the poem, is present in everybody's memory.

As for his incapacity to understand the development of an action, B shows certainly, by the suppression of Wrong as father

[1] A, IX, 110.

[2] *Cambridge History*, p. 32.

of Meed, the giving of "Amendes" to her as a mother, and the other modifications in the passage, that he well understood how an action should develop. C shows it even better by the suppression of the lines telling, in previous versions, how Piers tore up his bull of pardon out of spite, and simply because contradiction had irritated him. This is one of the grandest, if not the grandest scene in the poem, the most memorable, even for us to-day, the culminating point of the work. "Pleyn pardoun" is granted to ploughmen and other poor people who have led hard lives on this earth without murmuring; it is the recompense of their humility; the Lord gives it to them "for love of heore lowe hertes."[1] Piers, can we see your pardon?

> And Pers at his preyere· the pardon unfoldeth,
> And I bi-hynden hem bothe· bi-heold al the bulle.
> In two lines hit lay· and not a lettre more,
> And was i-written riht thus· in witnesse of treuthe:
> *Et qui bona egerunt ibunt in vitam eternam;*
> *Qui vero mala, in ignem eternum.*

It is only in revising his text for the last time that the author felt how greatly improved the whole episode would be if cut short here, that the action was now fully developed, and that any addition, and especially the tearing of the bull by Piers whose main treasure it should have been, simply spoilt it. He therefore suppressed this incident, twenty-six lines in all, and having briefly shown by the priest's remark that such a teaching was too high for vulgar ecclesiastics, he tells us he awoke as the sun was setting in the south, and he found himself

> Meteles and moneyles· on Malverne hulles.[2]

If the vague subject of Dowel, Dobet, Dobest, inspires the author of B and C with as much rambling as the author of the second part of A, it inspires him, too, with several of those splendid touches of eloquence and feeling which also shine in that same second part—and nowhere else in the literature of the day.

[1] A, VIII, 87 ff. [2] C, X, 295.

There we find, for example, added in version B, the incomparable prayer to the Creator, in passus XIV:

> Ac pore peple, thi prisoneres· lorde, in the put of myschief,
> Conforte tho creatures· that moche care suffren
> Thorw derth, thorw drouth· alle her dayes here,
> Wo in wynter tymes· for wantyng of clothes,
> And in somer tyme selde· soupen to the fulle;
> Comforte thi careful· Cryst, in thi ryche,
> For how thow confortest alle creatures· clerkes bereth witnesse,
> *Convertimini ad me et salvi eritis.*[1]

In version B also we find, for the first time, the great passus on "Crystes passioun and penaunce,"[2] with the author awakening at the end, to the sound of Easter bells, not saddened and anxious, as formerly while the sun was going down on Malvern hills, but cheered and joyful on the morning of the Resurrection. It is difficult to read such passages, so full of fervor, so sincere, and so eloquent, without thinking of Dante or Milton—unless one chooses to think of Langland alone.

VII

Studying text C apart from the others, Professor Manly points out certain traits special to it and marking it, he believes, as the work of a separate author. Two examples are quoted by him of "C's failure to understand B" (p. 33); other instances, we are told, might be given, but these are doubtless the most telling ones. The first example consists in a comparison of ll. 11–16 in the prologue of B with the similar expanded passage forming ll. 9–18 in C, passus I. Professor Manly considers the picture entirely spoilt. Be it so; the case, as we shall see, would be far from a unique one; more than one author spoilt, in his old age, the work of his youth. But it is not certain that it is so, and many, I think, would not willingly lose the new line added there to broaden the spectacle offered to the view of the dreamer who sees before him:

> Al the welthe of this worlde· and the woo bothe.

The second example is the change introduced in ll. 160–66 of the Prologue in B (episode of the Rat Parliament). The "raton

[1] B, XIV, 174. [2] B, XVIII; C, XXI.

of renon" suggests that a bell be hung to the neck of the cat: there are certain beings in "the cite of London," who bear bright collars and go as they please "bothe in wareine and in waste;" if there was a bell to their collar, men would know of their coming and run away in time. Clearly, according to Mr. Manly, those beings, those "segges," are dogs, and C made a grievous mistake in supposing them men; he cannot therefore be the author of B.

But in reality they *were* men. C made no mistake, and, on the contrary, improved the passage. The allusions were incoherent in B. What were those beings, living in London, roaming in warrens, and wearing collars, whom if a bell were added to their collars, *men* would be able to avoid?

Men myȝte wite where thei went· and awei renne.

The author of C very justly felt that the passage should be made clearer; he had, of course, never intended really to mean dogs (from which people are not accustomed to run away) but men, those very "knyȝtes and squiers" whom he now names for our clearer understanding, and who had taken then to wearing costly gold collars—a well-known fashion of the period—being themselves the very sort of "segges" the poorer people might have reason to fear. He therefore names them and no one else, and is careful to suppress the allusion in B to their appearing so adorned "in wareine and in waste." There was no "misunderstanding" on the part of C; just the reverse; and he deserves thanks instead of blame.

Considering this version as a whole, Professor Manly describes the author as having been, so it seems to him, "a man of much learning, true piety, and of genuine interest in the welfare of the nation, but unimaginative, cautious, and a very pronounced pedant." This amounts to saying, as everybody will agree, that C is the work of an older man than A and B, which simply confirms the point of view I defend. Increasing piety, more care for politics, more cautiousness, less imagination, a greater show of learning (in the last edition he gave of his *Essays*, Montaigne added about two hundred Latin quotations[1]) are so many characteristics of age, none of them implying a difference of authorship.

[1] P. Villey, *Les sources des Essais de Montaigne*, Paris, 1908, Vol. I, p. 402.

It is an untoward circumstance for Mr. Manly's theory that his successive writers seem to have been each one older than his predecessor, just as if the same man had been living to revise his own work.

Concerning the textual changes and additions in C, Mr. Manly declares that "they are numerous and small, and not in pursuance of any well-defined plan. There are multitudinous alterations of single words and phrases, sometimes to secure better alliteration, sometimes to get rid of an archaic word, sometimes to modify an opinion, but often for no discoverable reason, and occasionally resulting in positive injury to the style or the thought" (p. 30). Precisely; and this is what an author, in the evening of life, would do for his own work and what no one else would; a reviser would have undertaken the work for some cause and with "a well-defined plan." At times, says Professor Manly, "one is tempted to think that passages were rewritten for the mere sake of rewriting." Just so, and who, except the author himself, would take so much trouble? An absolutely parallel case is offered by no less a man than Ronsard, who revised his whole works and gave one last edition of them in 1584, the year before his death. The changes introduced by him are of such a nature that they can be described as follows: "There are multitudinous alterations of single words and phrases, sometimes to secure better [cadence], sometimes to get rid of an archaic word, sometimes to modify an opinion, but often for no discoverable reason, and occasionally resulting in positive injury to the style or the thought," this latter mishap being far more frequent with Ronsard than with Langland, and the friends of the French poet deploring, in his own day, his unfortunate changes.[1]

Mr. Manly considers that the author of C shows not only more pedantry in increasing the number of quotations, but more learning: "C is a better scholar than either the continuator of A (who translated *non mecaberis* by 'slay not' and *tabescebam* by 'I said nothing') or B (who accepted without comment the former of these errors)." One might well answer that there is nothing extraordinary in a student knowing more in his later years than

[1] See, e. g., Pasquier, *Recherches de la France*, Book VI, chap. vii.

in his youth. But, in reality, scholarship is here out of the question, and the utmost that can be said, in view of the knowledge displayed everywhere else by the same writer, is that when he wrote *mecaberis* and *tabescebam*, the analogy of sounds evoked in his mind the thought of *mactabis* and *tacebam*. Revising his text he noticed one of these *misprints* and forgot the other; but he noticed that one too in his next edition and corrected it: exactly what could be expected from a poet, who draws, in version A, two lists of the Seven Sins, both wrong, and corrects them when writing B, adding, however, in this version another list of the Seven Sins, equally wrong. It cannot certainly be pretended that our author was a man of minute accuracy, for, as Mr. Skeat has observed, "he cites St. Matthew when he means St. Luke, and St. Gregory when he means St. Jerome,"[1] which is worse than to have left uncorrected, or even to have written, *tabescebam* instead of *tacebam* and *Fals* instead of *Favel*. If one of the versions had shown minute accuracy throughout, that would have told, in a way, for the theory of multiple authorship; but we find nothing of the kind, and the last list of the Seven Sins is left in C definitively wrong.

VIII

Such is, as I take it, the truth concerning the supposed differences between the three versions. But let us, as a counter experiment, admit that it is not so, and let us accept all those differences at Professor Manly's own estimation. In order that they prove anything, experience must have shown that whenever similar ones are detected in the various revisions or the various parts of a work, a multiple authorship is certain.

To say nothing of Chaucer and of his tales of the Clerk, the Miller, and the Parson, we would have, if this theory held good, to admit that the first three acts of *Hamlet* were written by one Shakespeare, and the two last by another—an obvious fact: note the differences of merit, so much genius and so little, the glaring discrepancies between the two parts, Hamlet slim and elegant, the "mould of fashion" in the first acts, fat and asthmatic in the

[1] Preface of B, p. xiv (E. E. T. S.).

last; remember our being told that Hamlet has "foregone all customs of exercise" since Laertes left, and later that, since Laertes went, he has been "in continual practice;" Laertes himself, a brave and honorable young man in the first acts, a cowardly murderer at the end, and so on. As Professor Manly says concerning the separate poet to whom he attributes the second part of A, the author of the latter part of the play "tried to imitate the previous writer, but succeeded only superficially, because he had not the requisite ability as a writer, and because he failed to understand what were the distinctive features in the method of his model."[1] It even seems, at times, as if the author of the two last acts had never read the three first: dual authorship should therefore be held as more than proved.

The whole story of literature will have to be rewritten: strong doubts will be entertained whether the revised version of the *Essays* of 1588 is really by Montaigne, the differences with the former ones offering some remarkable analogies with those pointed out in *Piers Plowman*.[2] There will be a question as to the first part of *Don Quixote* being by the same Cervantes as the last,[3] and *Paradise Regained* by the same Milton as *Paradise Lost*. But this is nothing: here is a grand poem, of great originality, full of love and adventures, revealing withal the highest aims; a masterpiece received at once as such and ever since. And we have also a revision, the work obviously of a feebler hand, of a less gifted genius, a cautious man, very pedantic. All that was best and most original in the first text has been suppressed or toned down; the subject is modern, yet we now find that the character of

[1] *Cambridge History*, p. 17.

[2] In the first edition of the *Essays* (to quote an opinion not at all expressed in view of the present discussion, as it dates from 1897) the thought of Montaigne "est hardie dans l'expression; elle a le ton haut et résolu de celui qui s'émancipe. Plus tard, au contraire, elle baissera la voix, comme on la baisse pour dire des choses graves dont on sait la portée." In his same last version, Montaigne "disjoint ses raisonnements, coupe le fil de ses déductions, en y intercalant des remarques étrangères; la pensée primitive se morcèle ainsi et se désagrège. . . . . Son livre est devenu pour Montaigne une sorte de tapisserie de Pénélope, qu'il ne défait certes pas, car il retranche peu, mais dont il relâche les mailles, y travaillant toujours sans l'achever jamais."—Paul Bonnefon, in Julleville's *Histoire de la Littérature Française*, III, 454, 468.

[3] "A certain undertone of melancholy has been perceived in his second part. . . . . At whiles he moralise[s] with that touch of sadness natural to a man of many years and trials, for whom life is only a retrospect."—T. Fitzmaurice-Kelly, Introduction to his reprint of Shelton's translation of *Don Quixote*, London, 1896, Vol. III, p. xxiv.

the hero has been so remodeled as to recall Achilles; other personages are so modified as to resemble Hector, Nestor, Patrocles. Here are indeed differences! Yet we should be wrong in assuming that the *Gerusalemme Liberata* and the *Gerusalemme Conquistata* are the work of several Tassos.

Here is another work, and the analogy is even closer; it is an English masterpiece. It appeared in one volume, full of the most interesting and best "visualised" scenes, every incident so well presented and so true to life as to be unforgettable, the book attaining at once an immense popularity, being translated into every language, and keeping to this day its hold on readers throughout the world. We are confronted with two continuations. The earliest is a weak imitation of the first work, the visual power has diminished; strange happenings of the usual kind are expected to make up for the lack of better qualities; it is impossible to stop reading the first part when once begun, it is difficult to read the second to its end. In the next continuation, the differences are yet deeper, the author makes faint attempts to connect his work, by allusion, with the first one, but all has become vague and allegorical; theological mists have replaced tangible realities. Afraid apparently of detection, the author of this part goes so far as to pretend that the first one was "allegorical," though also "historical": a barefaced slander on the original work. The new part is full of rambling disquisitions on man and his duties, on atheism, and on Providence, with an imaginary journey to the world of spirits and a visit to Satan: "Here, I say, I found Satan, keeping his court or camp, we may call it which we please." The conclusion of the book is, that "a great superintendency of divine Providence in the minutest affairs of this world," and the "manifest existence of the invisible world" have been demonstrated. A difference of authorship is the more obvious that there was not between the publications of these three volumes, anonymous all of them, a lapse of years allowing the author to become, so to say, a different man: it did not take two years for the three to appear.

Yet, for all that, the three were the work of the same writer, and the titles he gave to them were: *Life and strange surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe—Farther Adventures of Robin-*

son Crusoe—Serious Reflections . . . . of Robinson Crusoe, with his Vision of the Angelick World. The first part appeared in 1719, the last in 1720. Shall we have to believe in three different Defoes?

IX

I mentioned at the outset that all the indications in the MSS, whether titles of the different parts, colophons, or notes added by former day owners, agreed in showing that we had to do with a single work, the work of a single author; none to the contrary being discernible. One more connecting link between the three versions remains to be noticed.

At various places in each, and with more abundance as time passed, the author gave some details about himself, his train of thoughts, and his manner of life. All these details are simple, plain, clear, most of them of no interest whatever, if untrue; they are not meant to show the poet to advantage, but have, on the contrary, often the tone of a confession: *video meliora proboque, deteriora sequor.* Localities are mentioned with a precision and definiteness unequaled in the ample dream-literature of that period, where poets usually go to sleep by the side of an anonymous brook, in a nameless country. Here two regions, one a very unusual one in poetry, are named so as to draw special attention, Malvern with her hills, her mists, and the vast plain at the foot of the slopes; London, with its cathedral of many chantries, its great people wearing bright collars, its poorer ones in their "cots," its principal thoroughfares and suburbs, Cornhill, Cheapside, Cock Lane, Garlickhithe, Tyburn, Southwark, Shoreditch, where lives "dame Emme," Westminster with the king's palace and the law courts. The allusions to Welshmen confirm the inference that Malvern is not a name chosen at random, as the author expresses such ideas as would occur to a man of the Welsh border. They are natural in such a one, and would be much less so in a Kentish or Middlesex man. There is in Chaucer one mention of Wales: it is to describe it as the refuge of Christians during the period of the old-time invasions:

To Walis fled the cristianitee.[1]

[1] *Man of Law*, l. 446.

Gower mentions Wales, but only to say that it was the place from which came the bishop who baptized King Allee.[1]

All those personal notes, scattered in versions belonging, as everybody acknowledges, to dates far apart, accord quite well one with another. If Mr. Manly's four anonymous authors are responsible for them, they showed remarkable cleverness in fusing into one their various personalities, to the extent even of growing more talkative, "cautious," and "pedantic," as years passed, so as to convey the impression of the same man growing older—the more meritorious, too, as the taking-up of somebody else's work to revise it, is rarely a task assumed at the end of one's life, so that the chances are that the supposed reviser of C was not an old man; yet he cleverly assumed Eld's habits and ways of speech.

Not only do the tone of the work and the nature of the additions denote that B was written by an older man than A, and C by an older man than B, but the fact is expressly stated in the course of the private confidences added in each version. At the beginning of passus XII in B, Ymagynatyf, besides telling us that the author has followed him "fyve and fourty wyntre" (which one is free to take literally or not), specifies that the poet is no longer young, and that he has reached middle age, though not yet old age. I have often moved thee to think of thy end, says Ymagynatyf,

> And of thi wylde wantounesse· tho thow ȝonge were,
> To amende it in thi myddel age· lest miȝte the faylled
> In thyne olde elde.[2]

In C, written many years later, the "fyve and fourty wyntre," which could no longer be even approximately true, are replaced by the vague expression "more than fourty wynter," and in the long and very interesting passage, reading like a sort of memoirs, added at the beginning of passus VI, the author speaks of himself as "weak," and of his youth as being long passed:

> "Whanne ich ȝong was," quath ich· "meny ȝer hennes . . . ."[3]

[1] *Confessio Amantis*, II, l. 904.

[2] B, XII, 6. "Concupiscentia Carnis" had told him, it is true: "Thow art ȝonyge and ȝepe and hast ȝeres ynowe" (XI, 17). But this occurs in a passage where Fortune shows to the author, in a mirror called "mydlerd" (earth or the world), an allegory of man's whole life; it is therefore preserved in C. It may also be observed that it agrees with the character of "Concupiscentia Carnis" to speak thus to men of *any* age.

[3] C, VI, 35.

How extraordinary is such minute care, in four different anonymous authors, who cannot have acted in concert, as each must have died to allow the other to do his revising unimpeded! such minute care, in order to give the impression of only one man revising his own work as he lived on, and grew older!—much less extraordinary, and therefore more probable, if the whole was, as I believe, the work of the same writer.

Not only do the personal intimations scattered in the three versions fit well together, but they fit such a man as would have composed such a poem, a man of enthusiasm and despondency, of a great tenderness of heart, in spite of a gaunt exterior and blunt speech, a man of many whims which he may occasionally have obeyed,[1] only to feel afterward the pangs of remorse, as if he had committed real crimes; describing himself then in the worst colors, and, what is well worthy of notice, giving throughout the impression of one who would attempt much in the way of learning without reaching complete proficiency in any branch, of one with an ungeometrical sort of mind, who could let many errors slip in the midst of his grand visions, pregnant sayings, vague dreams, and vain disquisitions. Nothing is more characteristic than the description of himself he attributes to Clergie in the very first version of the poem:

> The were lef to lerne· but loth for to stodie.[2]

In a line added in B, he makes Holy Church recall his lack of steady zeal:

> To litel latyn thow lernedest· lede, in thi ȝouthe.[3]

He describes himself elsewhere as "frantyk of wittes."

On this, Mr. Manly limits himself to stating briefly that all such details must be imaginary, and he refers us to Prof. Jack who "has conclusively proved" that all these indications were fictitious. "Were any confirmation of his results needed, it

[1] Coveytyse-of-eyes· cam ofter in mynde
Than Dowel or Dobet· amonge my dedes alle.
Coveytyse-of-eyes· conforted me ofte,
And seyde, "have no conscience· how thow come to gode."
—B, XI, 49.

[2] A, XII, 6.

[3] B, I, 139; not in A; preserved in C.

might be found in the fact that the author gives the name of his wife and daughter as Kitte and Kalote . . . . typical names of lewd women, and therefore not to be taken literally as the names of the author's wife and daughter" (p. 34).

But if those names had such a meaning that part of the poem would be unintelligible anyway, whoever the author be. Those names appear in the splendid passage where the poet is awakened by the bells on Easter morn:

> And kallyd Kytte my wyf· and Kalote my doughter,
> 'A-rys, and go reverence· godes resureccioun,
> And creop on kneos to the croys· and cusse hit for a juwel
> For goddes blissed body· it bar for owre bote.'[1]

To say that those names are the invention of a reviser is no explanation. Why should a reviser choose them, if they had such a meaning, and what can be his intention in showing himself, at this solemn moment, surrounded with such a disreputable family?

The truth is that the opprobrious meaning thus attributed to these names at that date is a mere assumption in support of which no proof is being adduced. Names for which such a bad fate is in store always begin by being honorable; then comes a period during which they are used in the two senses; then arrives the moment of their definitive doom. The parallel French word *catin*, derived like Kitte from Catherine, was for a long time a perfectly honorable word; the second period began for it at the Renaissance; but then, and for a great many years, it was used both ways. It appears with the meaning of a strumpet in Marot:

> Une catin, sans frapper a la porte,
> Des cordeliers jusqu'en la cour entra.[2]

But the same word is used to designate the Queen of France in one of the eclogues of Ronsard: *Catin* stands there for Catherine de Médicis.[3] The same name again is employed much later by Madame Deshoulières as an honorable proper name, and by Madame de Sévigné as an infamous substantive.

[1] C, XXI, 473; B, XVIII, 426.

[2] Ed. Janet, Vol. III, p. 105; pointed out by Paul Meyer.

[3] Eclog. I, first speech of the "Premier Pasteur Voyageur." Elizabeth of France, daughter of Catherine and of Henri II, is there described as "fille de Catin."

As for *Kalote*, supposing *callet* to be really derived from it, it should be noted that the oldest example quoted in Murray's Dictionary of *callet* being used to designate "a lewd woman, trull, strumpet, drab," is of about 1500.

Except for this, we are referred, as I have said, to Prof. Jack, stated to have "conclusively proved" that nothing was genuine in the personal allusions scattered throughout *Piers Plowman*. As a matter of fact, Prof. Jack did nothing of the kind. He assumes at the start, in his essay,[1] the thoroughly skeptical attitude which is nowadays all the fashion. James I of Scotland, we were recently told, did not write the *Kingis Quhair;* Sir Philip Sidney was never in love with anybody, and his poems are literary exercises; he himself says they were not, and even names with marked animosity the husband of the lady; but that does not matter; we are not such fools and we know better. Shakespeare's dark woman never existed at all; he invented her to have the pleasure of drawing her edifying portrait. As for *Piers Plowman*, the author lets us understand that he made the very sort of studies that one must have made to write such a poem; he tells us that certain ecclesiastical functions allowed him to eke out a scant livelihood; that it happened to him to live in Malvern and in London, etc. Nonsense, all that; how could one believe that he really lived anywhere?

Yet, he probably did; poets are not bound to be always deceitful; their own private experience and real feelings are, after all, the subject-matter readiest of access to them. Why should they ever go such a long way to invent, when it would be so easy for them to copy? Of course, when they tell us tales of wonder, or of events markedly to their advantage, we should be on our guard; but when they plainly state plain facts, of small interest if untrue, contradicted by no document and by no historical fact, the chances are that they speak from experience, the personal element in the statement being precisely what makes it seem interesting to them. We are not bound to believe that a real eagle carried to the House of Fame, beyond the spheres, such a precious and consid-

[1] "The Autobiographical Elements in Piers the Plowman," in the *Journal of Germanic Philology*, Bloomington (Ind.), Vol. III, 1901, No. 4.

erable load as was our friend Chaucer. But when the same Chaucer describes himself as going home after having made his "rekenynges," and reading books until his sight is "dasewyd,"[1] we would be quite wrong in displaying here any of our elegant skepticism: for it so happens that documentary evidence corroborates the poet's statements, and authentic records tell us of the sort of "rekenynges" the poet had to attend to and the kind of work which would impair his sight.

Why believe, says Prof. Jack, that our author was, in any way, connected with Malvern? He names those hills, it is true, but "of these he gives us no description." Why should he? He may have had some "personal acquaintance with London," but "certainly we cannot affirm that he ever lived there or even ever saw it."[2]

Well may one be skeptical about such skepticism. When, in the course of a work of the imagination, among fancy cities and real ones, we find the absolutely uncalled-for sentence: "Se transporte à Chinon, ville fameuse, voire première du monde," we would be wrong to suppose that this name has been put there at random; for the city was the birthplace of the author of the work, Rabelais. When, in the same work, we find that Pantagruel "estoit logé à l'Hostel sainct Denis" in Paris, nothing would be more natural, it seems, than to suppose the name to be a chance one. Closer scrutiny has recently shown that the Hostel Sainct Denis belonged to the abbot of St. Denis and housed Benedictine monks who came to Paris to study. Rabelais was a member of the order, and must have frequented this same hostel at some of his stays in Paris, hence his choice.[3]

Nothing more elegant, to be sure, than skepticism. Yet it should not be carried too far, for fear of hard facts giving the lie to its fancies. What more airy being than Ronsard's Cassandre, with the conventional praise of her perfections, sonnet after sonnet embodying ideas, similes, and eulogies which had done duty

[1] *Hous of Fame*, II, 145, 150.

[2] Pp. 406, 413.

[3] H. Clouzot, *Modern Language Review*, July, 1908, p. 404.

numberless times from the days of Laura if not even earlier. Yet this typical creature of a poet's brain has just turned out to have been a real woman, and to have been such as Ronsard described her, with dark hair and complexion, living at Blois, and bearing in real life the romantic and unusual name of Cassandre, for she was Cassandra Salviati, an Italian.

Prof. Jack seems to have himself felt some misgivings, for which credit should be accorded him. After having started on such lines that he was nearing apace the conclusion that *Piers Plowman* had grown somehow, without having been written by any man who might have led any sort of life anywhere; after having taken the unnecessary trouble to investigate whether the author did actually sleep and have the dreams he speaks of (an investigation of the carrying capacities of Chaucer's eagle would be welcome); and after also undertaking to refute the opinion, advanced by no one, that Langland was "a professional wanderer" and "spent his life in roaming about," Prof. Jack comes to terms. And his terms are not so very unacceptable after all. He admits, as "quite probable, that in this satirical picture of the clergy of that day the poet also had in mind the struggles by which he himself rose, and was at that moment rising, above the low moral level of the churchmen about him;" that the statements concerning his being nicknamed Long Will, living in Cornhill, etc., "may be true;" that we may find "between the lines" in the poem "valuable hints for drawing a rough sketch of his life;" that he himself, Prof. Jack, should "not be understood as denying to it all autobiographical elements; the opinions, hopes, and fears of the author are surely here."[1] This is enough to enable us to maintain that Prof. Jack has not "conclusively proved" the autobiographical details in the poem to be "not genuine, but mere parts of the fiction." He has not, and does not pretend that he has.

So long as no positive text or fact contradicts the plain statements in the poem, we hold ourselves entitled to take them for for what they are given, and to consider, at the very least, that the sum of accessible evidence favors our views rather than others' skepticism.

[1] Pp. 410, 412, 413, 414.

We persist therefore in adhering to our former faith, and in rejecting the hypothesis of the four or five authors revising one single work, each taking care to write as if he was an older man than his predecessor, leaving behind him nothing else in the same style, and dying, each in succession, to make room for the next. We hold that the differences in merit, opinions, dialect, etc., do not justify a belief in a difference of authorship, and that the shifted passage so cleverly fitted in by C at its proper place, far from hurting our views, confirms them. We believe, in a word, that, as we read in one of the MSS, "William Langland made Pers Ploughman."

Before coming to an end, however, I must repeat that, strongly as I dissent from Prof. Manly's conclusions, my gratitude toward him for his discovery and my sympathy for the sincerity and earnestness of his search, equal those of any other student. It is certainly difficult to enjoy better company than Professor Manly's on the road leading to the shrine of "St. Treuth."

J. J. JUSSERAND

WASHINGTON
November 9, 1908

THE SOURCE OF THE FOUNTAIN-STORY IN THE *YWAIN*

About two years ago Professor Nitze, in an article[1] whose object was to establish a new source for the *Ywain*, declared that the central point of that romance is the episode of the fountain. "The *Yvain* is what it is," he says, "by reason of the episode of the fountain. That constitutes the distinctive element of the romance, the other elements being either subsidiary or present in a greater or less degree in the other works of Crestien."[2] This I think is not questioned by any critic of the romance, and I heartily agree with Nitze in regard to it. But he goes on to try to prove that the source of this episode is classical, which practically implies that the main source of the *Ywain* itself is classical, since the fountain episode is the heart of it. He contends that in the episode we have a direct survival of the Arician myth of Diana. To establish this, he separates one religious custom from the Diana cult as it existed among the Romans, and by a comparison with this isolated practice tries to show that Crestien derives his fountain-story from a possible form of it that may have been carried to the northern provinces in the stream of Roman civilization. But this Roman practice, to which Nitze appeals, is not a very close parallel. It is the guarding of the sacred grove and lake of Aricia by an armed priest, who keeps watch to guard off all intruders. In course of time one makes his way in, usually a runaway slave, and challenges the priest by breaking a sacred bough near the deity's temple. A combat ensues, the victor of which is the future defender of the grove. Where in this myth is the fountain and the storm rising from the disturbance of its waters, as in the *Ywain?* Moreover, Nitze brings forward no trace whatever of the survival of the Roman custom in the north; he merely cites several authorities to prove

[1] "A New Source of the *Yvain*," *Modern Philology*, Vol. III, pp. 267–81.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 279.

that Diana was worshiped there.[1] There is little likelihood that Crestien took his material from this myth, which is so far removed from him, and which cannot be proved to have survived in a northern form. It is much more natural to assume that the romancer would make use of material close at hand, if there were such. And there was plenty of it. The place where I found it would be the first one to turn to in the search—the collections of fountain-lore made by the mediaeval encyclopaedists, who gathered up every fountain-story written or told at that time. An examination of these stories such as I shall try to make, will show that in them are present two distinct elements, one of which is entirely classical and bears no resemblance at all to Crestien's story, and the other of which contains every feature of his story and is most probably Celtic.

A list of fourteen stock stories is here given, all of them classical, and all occurring in the majority of the encyclopaedists:

1. Fountains healing for the eyes.
2. Fountains in Africa whose waters make a sweet melody.
3. Two fountains in Boeotia, one giving memory, the other forgetfulness.
4. Two fountains, one causing fertility, the other barrenness in women.
5. Fountain whose waters make the drinkers dropsical.
6. Two fountains, one of which makes black sheep white, the other, white black.
7. Two fountains, in one of which all things sink, in the other of which all things float.
8. Fountain which changes color four times a year, becoming successively muddy, clear, blood-red, and green.
9. Fountain daily three times bitter and three times sweet.
10. Fountain putting out lighted torches near it, and lighting them again.
11. Fountain icy cold by day and boiling by night.
12. Fountain rising at sight of red.

[1] There is no proof of the survival of anything but the name of the divinity. See two articles by Waldemar Kloss on "Herodias the Wild Huntress" in *Modern Language Notes* for March and April, 1908. Diana was simply the incarnation of the Evil One, the leader of the nightly witch-dance. It was one of the classical names that were taken over in the Middle Ages and given to spirits elsewise thoroughly mediaeval.

13. Intermittent fountains, running only at certain hours and on certain days.

14. Fountains changing wood to stone.

Since the encyclopaedists are generally careful to give their authorities, it is easily seen that these stories came down ultimately from Pliny by way of Solinus of the third and Isidore of Seville of the sixth century. In none of these fourteen stock stories am I able to find a single element which can be compared with Crestien. Outside of this list, however, I find one classical story which might at first appear to have some relation to the *Ywain* story. It is told by Solinus, Jaques de Vitry, and Alexander Neckham. Solinus, in describing Sicily, says: "In Halesina regione fons, alias quietus et tranquillus, quum siletur, si insonent tibiae exsultabundus ad cantus elevatur et quasi admiretur vocis dulcedinem ultra margines intumescit."[1] But this Sicilian fountain in reality has scarcely anything in common with the *Ywain* fountain. In the latter the water-spirit is outraged and a violent storm breaks out; in the former the water is "charmed with the sweetness of the sound," and simply rises above its margin. This is all the classical material in the encylopaedists, but it is by no means all the fountain material I have found here.[2] A great many other stories appear which have no roots in

[1] Cap. 5, 20.

[2] Some characteristics of the universal type of well-cult might be mentioned at this point; later on it will be made clear how the *Ywain* story differs from this as well as from the classical material just considered. The cult of water is as widespread as the race itself, and has certain universal characteristics not distinctive of any one place. J. G. Frazer in his *Golden Bough* (1890), p. 4, describes a tribe in New South Wales in which to produce rain the wizard goes to the bed of the creek, drops water on a round flat stone, and then conceals it. He says also in a note to his translation of Pausanias, Vol. IV, p. 383, that in Gilolo, a large island west of New Guinea, the sorcerer makes rain by dipping the branch of a particular kind of tree in water and sprinkling the ground with it. The most striking usage Frazer mentions is that of the Apache Indians, who to cause rainfall throw water on a certain point high on a rock (*Golden Bough*, p. 4). The Greek Pausanias of the second century A. D., in his *Description of Greece*, Book viii, chap. 38, gives evidence of fountain-cult there: ". . . . and Hagno gave her name to a spring on Mt. Lycaeus, which like the river Danube flows with an equal body of water winter and summer. If there is a long drought, and the seeds in the earth and the trees are withering, the priest of Lycaean Zeus looks to the water and prays; and having prayed and offered the sacrifices enjoined by custom, he lets down an oak branch to the surface of the spring, but not deep into it; and the water being stirred, there rises a mist-like vapor, and in a little the vapor becomes a cloud, and gathering other clouds to itself it causes rain to fall on the land of Arcadia." A great many other primitive or very early stories might be given, all with the same universal features. The sole object in all is the production of rain, and this is obtained by the propitiation of a divinity in the water, who is at least non-hostile.

antiquity, but spring most likely from Celtic soil. Such are the stories of bits of wood floating in wells, which would be mysteriously returned to the wells no matter to what distance carried; stories of fresh-water springs with a tide like the sea; and of wells haunted by demons who dragged men in or did them some harm. The earliest Welsh historian, Nennius, describes only five fountains, one of which is classical, the others showing strong characteristics of this new mass of material which I have just called Celtic.[1] Geoffrey of Monmouth in his *Vita Merlini* gives the entire list of classical stories, without a single other feature. The stories of Giraldus Cambrensis are in great part new,[2] and among his new, non-classical stories I find this very important one of a fountain in Munster, Ireland:

> Est fons in Momonia, qui si tactus ab homine, vel etiam visus fuerit, statim tota provincia pluviis inundabit. Quae non cessabunt, donec sacerdos ad hoc deputatus, qui et virgo fuerit a nativitate, missae celebratione, in capella quae non procul a fonte ad hoc dignoscitur esse fundata et aquae benedictae lactisque vaccae unius coloris aspersione, barbaro satis ritu et ratione carente, fontem reconciliaverit."[3]

To this story Giraldus immediately adds another practically identical, except that the scene is laid not in Ireland but in Armorica:

> Est fons in Armorica Britannia, similis hujus ex parte naturae. Cujus aquis in cornu bubali haustis, si petram ei proximam forte perfuderis, tempore quantumlibet sereno et a pluviis alieno, pluvias incontinenti non evades.

It will be noticed that there are these striking elements common to this story and to the *Ywain* story: first, the offended guardian of the well avenges what it considers a violation of its consecrated dwelling; second, a terrible storm springs up suddenly.[4]

[1] The Irish Nennius, however, p. 197, tells of the "Well of Sliabh Bladhma," and says of it: "If anyone gaze at it or touch it, the sky will not cease to pour down rain until mass and sacrifice are celebrated." See Giraldus Cambrensis (Rolls Series), Vol. V, p. 89, n. 2.

[2] In some cases the new material seems indeed to have affected his classical stories, witness the old color-changing well, which with Giraldus instead of sheep's fleece changes men's hair. And Giraldus goes on further to tell of the well that prevents gray hair, adding slyly: "Hunc autem fontem feminae frequentant."

[3] *Topographia Hibernica*, dist. 2, cap. 7 and 8.

[4] It may be well to notice that still another element in the *Ywain* story is found here—the chapel of expiation near by.

Let us for convenience call this type of story the Sudden-Storm Story. These common elements clearly distinguish the Sudden-Storm Story, as it appears in Crestien and Giraldus, from the story of the classical type, as I have already indicated, and from the universal type of well-cult also.[1] The Sudden-Storm Story next appears in Alexander Neckham,[2] who, however, gives it on hearsay, as if he had it from various sources, and does not localize it. He says, "Asserunt esse fontem de quo hausta aqua si projiciatur super lapidem illi fonti vicinum, oriri videtur tempestas ex ipso lapide. Constat autem multam oriri pluviam repente, cum grandine et vento vehementi. Sed unde generetur haec tempestas quis definire praesumet?" Then follows the inevitable *instructio moralis*, which was always Neckham's main object, time and place being with him of secondary importance. Jaques de Vitry gives an account in which he places our Sudden-Storm Story in Armorica: "In minori Britannia fons quidam esse refertur cuius aquae supra propinquum lapidem projectas pluvias et tonitrua provocare dicantur."[3]

In Gervaise of Tilbury there are two stories of this kind: "Est in provincia regni Arelatensis fons quidem pellucidus, in quem si lapidem vel lignum aut hujusce modi materiam projeceris, statim de fonte pluvia ascendit, quae projecientem totum humectat." And,

> Est in Catalonia episcopatu Gerundensi, mons excelsus valde, cui nomen Cannarum accolae indiderunt. Hujus ambitus arduus et pro magna parte inaccessabilis ad ascensum, in cujus summitate lacus est, aquam continens subnigram et in fundo imperscrutabilem. Illic mansio fertur esse daemonum ad modum palatii dilatata, et janua clausa. Facies tamen ipsius mansionis, sicut ipsorum daemonum, vulgaribus est incognita ac invisibilis. In lacum si quis aliquam lapidem aut aliam projecerit materiam, statim, tanquam offensis daemonibus, tempestas erumpit.[4]

The first of these is located in Arles, and the second in Spain. To both of these places Celtic influences very probably extended.

[1] See n. 2, p. 333.

[2] *De naturis rerum*, Book ii, chap. 7.

[3] *Historia Orientalis*, chap. xci, printed in *Gesta Dei per Francos* (Hanover, 1611), p. 1112.

[4] *Otia Imperialia* (ed. Liebrecht), pp. 32 and 41.

Arles is not far from Marseilles, where stood in the time of the old Gauls a Druidic grove with mysterious trees and fountains, and Catalonia on the northeast corner of Spain may very likely have received Celtic traditions from the Gauls who crossed the Pyrenees and helped colonize the Spanish march under the Franks.

Nearly all of the Sudden-Storm Stories quoted so far were written in the twelfth century, and none of them is later than the first decade of the thirteenth. The last authority I shall quote is Thomas Cantapranus, who wrote shortly before the middle of the thirteenth century. He tells our Sudden-Storm Story twice, both times locating it in Great Britain. The first version appears in the reproduction of his *De natura rerum* by Konrad von Megenberg as follows: "Ez sint prunnen in dem grozen land Britannia wenn man der wazzer geuzt auf ainer stain nahen da pei so kūmt regen und donr und wegewiter."[1] The second is given in his own words much more in detail in the *Bonum Universale de Apibus*, with the title, "De repentina tempestate, arte daemonum suscitata, dum ex fonte quodam Britanniae aqua super vicinum lapidem effunditur." The complete story goes:

Quid autem hinc sub verissima attestatione contigerit ostendamus. Fratrem Henricum Theutonicum, quondam Lectorem fratrum Praedicatorum in Colonia, virum in omni scientia cum sanctitate conspicuum, de quo superius fecimus mentionem, attestantibus fratribus, narrentem quod subjungo audivi. Cum quidam frater nobilis genere & rebus pollens, de Britanniae partibus, ordinem Praedicatorum intrasset, apud Lugdonem Galliae cum fratribus morabatur: appropinquante autem tempore professionis suae petivit a Priori suo redire ad terram suam, ut disponeret de rebus suis: & annuit Prior cum eoque iter arripuit. Cumque venissent in deserta Britanniae, dixit frater Novitius Priori suo: Vultis videre antiquum illud Britanniae miraculum? Et Prior: Quod est illud? Et frater illum ducens ad fontem lucidissimum, super quem lapis instar altaris in columnis marmoreis locabatur, aquam protinus superfudit. Nec mora, contenebrato cęlo, coeperunt nubes concurrere, mugire tonitrua, imbres ruere, fulgura coruscare statimque tanta inundatio facta est, ut circa locum ad leucam unam tota terra obrui videretur. Quod ut vidit Prior miratus est, & audiente dicto fratre Henrico, magistro ordinis beatae memoriae fratri Joanni Episcopo, & alii pluribus fratribus enarravit. Hoc idem

[1] *Buch der Natur* (ed. Pfeiffer, 1861), chap. viii, p. 482.

audivi a patre meo ante annos quadraginta, qui illis in partibus sub rege Richardo Angliae militavit. Haec cum dictus frater Henricus mihi & multis aliis recitaret quaesivi, unde ista fieri potuissent? Et respondit, quod arte magici, ignota modo hominibus, & ministerio daemonum, qui ad tempestates & pluvias aera possunt impellere, & concitare cum volunt, occulto tamen Dei iudicio permittente.[1]

Though Thomas writes later, he indicates in more than one way that this story was current in Great Britain in the twelfth century, during the reign of Richard Cœur de Lion. He quotes as his authority for the story a certain Henry Theutonicus, whom he mentions elsewhere with great respect. Henry is referred to also by Caesarius von Heisterbach, who concludes one of his chapters with this testimony to Henry the German's reputation as an authority on stories, "Testis huis visionis est Henricus Prior Praedicatorum in Colonia, qui se eam a praedicti loci Praeposito audivisse commemorat."[2] This Henry was besides a man of learning, educated at Paris, and reader of theology in the Dominican college at Cologne.[3] As Thomas tells us, the German had heard an account of the fountain from a man who had traveled in Great Britain, probably years before, and found the legend of the marvelous fountain thriving there as on native soil. Thomas goes on to tell us that he himself had heard the same story forty years before from his father, "who was a soldier in those parts under Richard king of England." His father must have heard it in England sometime during the short reign of Richard from 1189 to 1199. Thomas therefore brings forward two eyewitnesses of the existence of this fountain and its legend in England several years before the end of the twelfth century.[4]

It may be worth while to add here a story from an old manuscript which Hearne quotes in his edition of Robert of Gloucester.[5] It reads, "Est fons dulcissimus in arenis maris, ubi mare cotidie

[1] Ed. George Colvener, 1627, cap. 57, No. 28, p. 559.

[2] *Dialogus Miraculorum*, dist. 6, cap. 37.

[3] *Allgemeine deutsche Biog.*; from Quetif-Echard, Vol. I, p. 148.

[4] Even his seventeenth-century editor, Colvener, remarks on this as making Thomas' tale superior to other versions, "Ad hoc auctor noster oculatos profert testes," he says in the Appendix, p. 157, note.

[5] Appendix, p. 572 (Oxford, 1724): "An old folio ms in vellum given me by Richard Graves of Mickleton in Gloucestershire, Esq."

bis crescit et decrescit ad spacium fere mille pedum, et supercrescente et decrescente mari distat fons a salo septem pedes. Est lapis iuxta fontem, ad modum altaris factus in memore. In quacumque die tingitur lapis ille de aqua fontis ipsius, in eadem die foecundissime pluit." The story in this manuscript is the more curious in that it shows a degeneration of the storm into a mere rain, and introduces in a confused way another legend, that of the well with a tide like the sea. But since I cannot assign it to any particular date,[1] I can make no more use of it than to mention it as another sign that our story was localized in Great Britain.

The fact that we find this story in popular tradition before the end of the twelfth century in Great Britain, Ireland, and on the Continent where Celtic influences were most likely felt, would indicate that there was a Celtic parent-tradition from which it sprung.[2] If at about the time that Crestien wrote his *Ywain* a fountain-story identical with his was already current in Great Britain, it is obvious that it could not have been taken from him. There is much more in favor of the view that the dependence is not of Britain on Armorica, or of Armorica on Britain, but of all on the same common tradition. The variations of the story therefore may all be explained as the result of the independent development of the legend with each branch of the Celts. For instance, in Great Britain it did not happen to be connected with any one place, but in Armorica it was attached to the romantic Barenton in the forest of Broceliande.[3] Crestien's story in the

[1] The date is most probably much later than the thirteenth century.

[2] The beginnings of elements of the Sudden-Storm Story may be traced even among the early Gauls. Lucan in the *Pharsalia*, 3, 399-425, describes a Druidic wood near Marseilles with its sacred dark-running fountains. And Gregory of Tours in the *Liber de gloria confessorum*, cap. 2, tells of a lake at the foot of Mount Helanus at which every year the inhabitants of the country round used to pay sacrifice for three days, and on the fourth day when they were preparing to leave, a furious storm would arise with thunder and lightning, and rain fall so heavily that they could scarce get off with their lives. ". . . . Veniebant autem cum plaustris potum cibumque deferentes, mactantes animalia et per triduum epulantes. Quarta autem die cum discedere deberent, anticipabat eos tempestas cum tonitruo et coruscatione valida; et in tantum imber ingens cum lapidum violentia descendebat, ut vix se quisquam eorum putaret evadere. Sic fiebat per singulos annos." Cf. A. Bertrand, *Nos origines*, Paris, 1897.

[3] Crestien was not even the first to attach it to Barenton. The earliest mention of the fountain of Barenton as such occurs in Wace, in the early part of the twelfth century, who tells us of it in his *Roman de Rou*, ll. 6439 ff. About the same time Guillaume le Breton in his *Philippis*, lib. 6, v. 445, says, "What causes produce the marvel of the fountain of

Ywain, then, is simply the continental form of this Celtic story, taken bodily into his romance, which through Crestien's popularity became the *locus classicus* for our fountain-legend.

If I am right so far in my conclusions that there was a common Celtic tradition at the root of this Sudden-Storm Story, it is only natural to suppose that some survival of it can be traced in modern legends. Such is found in Ireland, Wales, and of course in France. The legend as it exists in France and Wales has degenerated into a rain-making story, minus the storm. The later French form appears in a curious fifteenth-century manuscript entitled, "Usements et Coustumes de la forest de Brecilien." It reads,

> Joignant a la forest de Barenton y a une grosse pierre que on nomme le perron de Barenton; et toutes foiz que le seigneur de Montfort vient a ladite fontaine et de l'eau d'icelle arouse et mouille le dit perron, quelque chaleur temps (qu'il fasse) il pleut si abondonment au pays que la terre et les biens estant en icelle en sont arousez et moult leur profitte.

The story persists even today, for the children of Armorica throw pins into the fountain and cry, "Ris donc, fontaine de Barenton, et je te donnerai une épingle!"

The element of the disturbance of the water has survived in the village of Llanaelhaian in Wales. This village has a remarkable spring, with stone seats about for the bathers to rest on while they wait for the "troubling of the waters," which is the sudden welling-up of the waters charged with bright bubbles. A more complete Welsh survival remains in the story connected with the tarn Dulyn on Mount Snowdon. If water is dipped from the lake and thrown on the farthest out of a series of stepping-stones, it is said that rain will surely fall before night.

Broceliande? If any one draws water there and sprinkles some drops of it, clouds full of hail gather, thunder rolls, and the air is dark with thick shadows. And those who are present wish then never to have seen it at all, their stupor is so great, and fear terrifies them so much. The thing is marvellous, I grant, but it is true. Several are witnesses of it." See A. C. L. Brown in "*Iwain*, A Study in the Origins of Arthurian Romance," *Harvard Studies in Phil. and Lit.*, Vol. VIII, p. 127. He says that the question whether the fountain in the *Ywain* had already become rain-making and identified with Barenton before Crestien took up the story must remain undecided. The evidence of Wace and Guillaume decide it, however.

This story is parallel to the degenerate modern version in France, as I have before pointed out.[1]

In a comparatively modern Irish story there is a strikingly complete parallel to the Barenton legend. Diarmait and Finn Mac Cumaill set out in search of the latter's men carried away by a wizard, and sailed to the west until they came to a steep cliff. Diarmait climbed it and reached a beautiful plain, where stood a great tree, fruit-laden, and surrounded by a circle of pillar stones, the tallest of which rose beside a spring at the foot of a tree. Diarmait stooped to drink and as he did so heard a heavy tread; sprang up and saw nothing. This happened again. Then he caught sight of a drinking-horn on the central pillar stone and took it up. Scarcely had he drunk from it when a gruagach ("terrible fellow") came from the east in a coat-of-mail complete and a scarlet mantle, and angrily challenged Diarmait for his intrusion. The duel which ensued lasted all day, and in the evening the gruagach sprang into the well. Diarmait then killed a speckled deer in the forest and ate it. After next morning's breakfast he encountered the still angrier gruagach again. The same thing happened, and so on through the third day. In the evening of the fourth Diarmait put his arms around the gruagach and they both sank into the well. At the bottom Diarmait found the gruagach's brother, and together they made war on the Knight of the Fountain and killed him. This is precisely the same incident that appears in the *Ywain*—with one difference, that the revenge of the angered guardian of the well does not take the shape of a storm, but the guardian himself comes immediately and challenges the intruder.

It is needless to say that not one of these survivals can be traced back to Crestien as a source. In fact it is most unlikely that at any point on the road back to their ultimate origin they came in contact with the *Ywain* story, for they belong to the class of folk-material, which is separated by a wide gulf from the courtly romance, of which the *Ywain* is an example. My former conclusion as to the source of the *Ywain* fountain-story, then, is

[1] Also, in the *Owein* of the *Mabinogion* practically the same fountain incident occurs as in Crestien. But date and derivation of the *Mabinogion* are unsettled.

strengthened by this modern evidence. Crestien did not have to go to the classics for his legend, for the sufficient reason that at about the period of his literary activity, it was a thriving popular tradition in Great Britain, Ireland, and his own country. I have quoted several versions of it as it was told in the twelfth century, and traced survivals of it in modern folk-lore. The legend of the people had an existence and growth entirely independent of the romance, and could not have originated from the latter. On the other hand, the romancer might have easily embodied a popular tale in his work. This is what Crestien did. He took the story as he found it, and with great effect set it into the background of his courtly romance. At any rate, it is a very far cry back across the centuries to the Arician myth of Diana, even if the Sudden-Storm fountain were not well known among the people of Crestien's own time.

LOUISE B. MORGAN

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

BRYNHILD IN LEGEND AND LITERATURE

> Yet we twain together
> Shall wear through the ages,
> Sigurd and I.

So prophesies Brynhild in the Old Norse lays of the *Poetic Edda;* and her prophecy has been fulfilled. Originating in the misty dawn of myth, legend, and poetry, the story of the Volsungs and the Niblungs has lived for many centuries, in the literatures of many lands. And Sigurd and Brynhild hold their place with Tristram and Yseult, Lancelot and Guenevere, Romeo and Juliet, Paolo and Francesca, and other "star-crossed lovers." Among the characters in the old Volsung legend Brynhild is perhaps the most striking figure. Certainly none of the others has been the source of more disputes among scholars or of greater inspiration to poets. A heroine who would live through so many centuries of literature must submit to various fortunes and strange transformations. It is interesting to travel with her down through the ages, studying her as she appears in the earliest literary treatment and in the most notable of the many compositions which the story has inspired in succeeding centuries; to see how she has developed in harmony with the interests and ideals of the times, until she appears before us today as one of the most splendid figures in Wagner's music dramas.

The story in its best-known form, approximately that found in the Icelandic *Völsunga Saga* and in Morris' and Wagner's nineteenth-century versions, runs as follows. Sigurd or Siegfried, the fearless hero, slayer of the dragon, breaks through the encircling fire which he alone can pass, and awakens Brynhild or Brünnhilde, a valkyrie sunk in magic sleep. They are united in love. But later Sigurd is caused by enchantment to forget his betrothed and to love and wed another woman, Gudrun or Kriemhild. And assuming by magic the form of his brother-in-law, Gunnar or Gunther, he wins as bride for him his own first love. When

Brynhild learns of the treason and deception practiced upon her, she causes Sigurd's murder, and kills herself, to be united in death with her beloved.

It was the fashion some years since to assign mythological origins to the old legends, this one among others. Sigurd was supposed to represent some god—Odin, Freyr, or Baldr. The story of Sigurd and Brynhild was interpreted as a summer and winter or day and night myth. Sigurd is the god of Spring, who frees the Earth goddess from her imprisonment in the castle of Winter, and with his sword, the sunbeam, cuts her free from the covering of ice.[1] Or he is the god of Light, who in the morning drives away the mist dragons and awakens the Sun sleeping upon the mount of heaven, which shines like fire in the morning glow; but in the evening he is overcome again by the powers of darkness, who bear the Sun back into their misty realms beneath the earth.[2] This particular episode of the hero's awakening the sleeping maiden appears in various forms in European literature and folk-tales, and is familiar still in the story of the Sleeping Beauty.[3] Scholars seem inclined to admit that this episode was probably mythical in its origin.[4] But the fashion of mythical interpretation has in the main passed away, and later writers on the subject have considered that the essential kernel of the Sigurd-Brynhild story was in its origin purely human—about mortal heroes—and that later in its development it acquired some supernatural and mythical features.[5]

Though the Sigurd-Brynhild legend probably originated among the Rhine Franks, the oldest literary treatment of it which has come down to us is the Old Norse version in the *Elder Edda*, the collection of short poems originally written probably between the ninth and twelfth centuries. The character of Brynhild in these lays is interesting and impressive, appearing in flashes of poetry,

[1] W. Jordan, *Die Edda*, p. 7; K. J. Simrock, *Deutsche Mythologie*, p. 487.

[2] Paul's *Grundriss der germanischen Philologie*, Vol. II[1], p. 25.

[3] No. 50 in Grimm's *Household Tales*. See Hunt's translation, Vol. I, pp. 197 and 404.

[4] Paul's *Grundriss*, II', p. 25; H. Lichtenberger, *Le poème et la légende des Nibelungen*, pp. 84, 85.

[5] E. Mogk, *Die germanische Heldendichtung*, 1895, and J. Göbel, "On the Original Form of the Legend of Sigfrid," *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, Vol. XII (1897), pp. 461–74.

tragedy, and passion. But when we endeavor to analyze her accurately, to determine just what she is and just what she does, we encounter almost insuperable obstacles. For the *Poetic Edda* does not give us a single, consistent story, but detached, often fragmentary lays, treating different aspects or different forms of the legend. And when we try to discover exactly what is presented we inevitably become entangled in theories of the origin and development of the story. There are two main points concerning Brynhild on which scholars differ. The first is that of her identity. Is she, in these lays, a divine valkyrie, or the daughter of a mortal king? Are Brynhild and Sigrdrifa one and the same person here and in their origin, or two different persons, later combined into one? The second point, her relations with Sigurd, depends largely on the first. The dispute here centers especially on the question whether Sigurd originally met Brynhild and became betrothed to her before obtaining her for Gunnar, or whether his visit to her in Gunnar's form was his first meeting with her.

The arguments of the specialists on these questions are numerous and intricate. For the purposes of this paper it is not necessary to consider them at any length; but without at least a glimpse of the theories of the original form and the development of the legend it is hardly possible to discuss intelligently the contents of the lays, for the interpretation of the poems depends largely on the theory adopted.

Perhaps the most prominent and the clearest account of the growth of the story is that of the distinguished German scholar Mogk.[1] He believes that in the original Frankish saga the heroes were human beings, though idealized. Brynhild was no divine valkyrie, but a warrior maiden, who would marry only a man of superior power and strength. Sigurd came and betrothed himself to her. Then he married someone else and gave Brynhild to his brother-in-law, subduing her for her husband after their marriage. When she learned of this she caused his death and died with him. The story contained no supernatural or mythical elements. This

[1] *Die germanische Heldendichtung, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Sage von Siegfried u. Brunhild*, 1895.

developed among the Germans into the *Nibelungenlied* version. It also passed to the Norse poets, who added the purely Norse valkyrie motive and the magic sleep. There are still, thinks Mogk, two parallel sagas recognizable, in which the relations between Sigurd and Brynhild are differently conceived. In one, Sigurd wakes a divine valkyrie sleeping behind the wall of flame. In the other, he comes in youth to a bold princess, a maiden delighting in war, and is betrothed to her. In general, then, Mogk thinks that Brynhild resulted from a combination of two different figures—the valkyrie and the Amazonian princess—and that the early meeting and betrothal with Sigurd, previous to his obtaining her for Gunnar, was an original element in the legend.

Other scholars advance varying theories. Lichtenberger,[1] for example, agrees with Mogk in believing that Brynhild resulted from a union of two distinct legends, which he considers to have been that of the valkyrie Sigrdrifa—the "sleeping beauty" motive—and that of a mortal warrior maiden, won by trickery for another. He differs from Mogk in holding that the idea of Brynhild's early betrothal to Sigurd, previous to his obtaining her for Gunnar, was a late addition to the story. Another scholar, Sijmons,[2] agrees with this latter assertion, but differs from the other two in believing that the sleeping valkyrie Sigrdrifa and the daughter of the mortal king Budli were one and the same person. He argues, that is, for the original and essential unity of the figure of Brynhild. Finally, anyone with a taste for complexity may prefer to hold with a fourth scholar, Boer,[3] that the warrior maiden Brynhild and the valkyrie Sigrdrifa originally developed from the same idea—the "sleeping beauty" motive; but that at the time of the Eddic lays they were conceived of as different persons; and that they were later united again into one figure. Many other scholars besides these have, of course, entered into the controversy, and the several theories have been developed with much elaboration and variation of details.

With some notion of these problems in mind, it is possible to summarize more intelligently the actual contents of the lays deal-

[1] *Le poème et la légende des Nibelungen*, Paris, 1891.
[2] *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, Vol. XXIV (1892), pp. 1-32.
[3] *Ibid.*, Vol. XXXV (1903), pp. 289 ff.

ing with Brynhild, as far, that is, as their meaning can be definitely ascertained.

The most important is the long and striking Brynhild lay inappropriately known as the *Short Lay of Sigurd.* In it the interest of the poet centers on the thoughts and acts of Brynhild *after* her marriage with Gunnar, psychologically the most interesting part of the story. In the opening strophes, however, and in Brynhild's narrative just before her death, we get some account of the events preceding this marriage, and thus obtain a fairly complete view of the poet's conception of the whole course of the story. Brynhild is *not* mentioned as a valkyrie, nor is there any reference to her magic sleep or the surrounding fire. She is a mortal "shield-maiden," fond of war and averse to wedlock, the daughter of King Budli and the sister of Atli—who is, by the way, the great and terrible Attila, strangely wandering in mediaeval legend. The Giukings (Gunnar and his brethren) come to Atli's seeking her hand. Atli, by a threat of withholding from her her wealth, forces her to say that she will marry. She thinks of taking up arms in defense of her liberty, but decides to submit. Then she evidently plights her troth to Sigurd, who appears in Gunnar's form, and whom she has apparently never seen before, but whom she now loves with her great and only love. There is no mention of the feat to be performed to win her. But the narrative is extremely hazy and elliptical at this point. It is clear, however, that she and Sigurd are not united in wedlock, but that the Volsung keeps faith with Gunnar.[1] Brynhild never loves her husband. How she discovers the deception practiced upon her is not told; but she evidently does, for she refers to Gunnar's having beguiled her. She is apparently driven to desire Sigurd's death chiefly by jealousy—by the thought of Gudrun in his arms. She urges Gunnar to kill him, threatening otherwise to go back to her kin; but she alleges no wrong done her by Sigurd, advancing as a reason only that Gunnar may make his power greater than the Volsung's. Gunnar is unwilling to break faith with Sigurd, but rather than lose Brynhild and her treasure he finally consents. His brother Guttorm is induced to slay Sigurd as he lies in his

[1] See Magnusson and Morris' translation in *The Story of the Volsungs*, pp. 177 and 196.

bed. Before he dies the hero declares that Brynhild has caused his death, that she loved him, but that he has never been false to Gunnar. There is no suggestion of Sigurd's loving Brynhild. When she hears the wail of Gudrun over the body of her dead lord, Brynhild laughs once, but pales and looks strange. In answer to Gunnar's reproaches she relates the story of her life, professing her love for Sigurd and complaining of having been beguiled. Gunnar, who appears to love her passionately, tries to dissuade her from suicide, but in vain. Donning her gold byrny, she stabs herself with her sword. Then she prophesies to Gunnar. Finally, begging that she may be burned with Sigurd on his funeral pyre, and thus follow him to the other world, she dies.

The Fragments of the Lay of Brynhild deal chiefly with Sigurd's death, giving a rather different version of the tale, whereby Sigurd is slain out of doors, as in Wagner's music drama. The poem is so fragmentary and confused that it is difficult to get any definite story from it. In the parts remaining to us there is no mention of the valkyrie nature of Brynhild nor of the fire ride. She is referred to as Budli's daughter. Only one meeting between her and Sigurd is mentioned—apparently the occasion when he wooed her for Gunnar. The fragments open abruptly with a conversation between Gunnar and his brother Hogni, wherein the former urges as a reason for killing Sigurd that the Volsung has broken faith with him—apparently when wooing Brynhild for him. Hogni hints that Brynhild is urging the murder through jealousy of Gudrun. In the next fragment Sigurd is slain by Guttorm on the banks of the Rhine, and the news brought by Hogni to the queens. Brynhild declares that they did well to kill him, for they will now have great power which would have been his had he lived. Then she laughs once. Afterward she puzzles the people by lamenting the deed she had desired. She prophesies woe to the Niblungs for breaking their oaths with Sigurd; and asserts that when he wooed her for Gunnar he kept his vow, laying his sword between them. Then the lay breaks off. As nearly as one can judge from the fragments, they present about the same version of the Brynhild story as does the *Short Lay of Sigurd*, with the important exception that Gunnar

accuses Sigurd, though wrongly, of having broken faith in the wooing.

The lays we are to consider next give a rather different picture of the heroine. In the *Lay of Fafnir*, after Sigurd has slain the dragon and Regin, the birds sing to him of his future. First they tell him of Giuki's daughter, whom he can obtain with his gold. Then they describe to him[1] the hall on Hindfell surrounded by flames, where sleeps a warrior maiden, a valkyrie, plunged in slumber by Odin as a punishment for choosing in war the one he willed not. "You will see, O Hero, the helmed maid who rode from battle on Vinskornir. By the decree of the Norns Sigrdrifa cannot break the bonds of sleep."[2] According to some scholars "Sigrdrifa" is here merely an epithet applied to Brynhild, "the dispenser of victory,"[3] but others hold that it is the name of a person quite distinct from Budli's daughter. We may say, at all events, that the lay presents to us *a* valkyrie, whoever she may be, sleeping and surrounded by fire, because of disobedience of Odin. From the order in which the events are mentioned, it seems to indicate also, though this is disputed, that Sigurd went to Giuki's and was betrothed to Gudrun *before* he awakened the valkyrie sleeping on the mountain.

The very important *Lay of Sigrdrifa* is one of the centers of controversy, and is translated in various ways. According to the verses which have survived, it seems that a hero, presumably Sigurd,[4] awakens a sleeping maiden, cutting away her armor. In phrases of dignity and beauty she greets the world—the light of day, the gods. Then she gives Sigurd much sage advice on life in general. These "runes" seem to be generally admitted to be a later interpolation, due to the Norse passion for didactic poetry.[5] According to the accompanying prose explanations, of later date, she calls herself Sigrdrifa and is a valkyrie, condemned by Odin, because of her disobedience in causing the death of Hjalmgunnar, to act as valkyrie no more, but to sleep and to wed. She herself vowed to wed no one who felt fear. It seems evident that the

[1] Magnusson and Morris' translation, pp. 65, 66; Gering, pp. 210, 211.

[2] Translations of this passage differ widely.

[3] See Gering's translation.

[4] But see Boer, *op. cit.*, p. 295.

[5] Gering, *op. cit.*, p. 213.

compiler of the lays, who added the prose, understood Sigrdrifa to be a different person from Brynhild. As to whether she originally was or not, there is, as we have said, a profound difference of opinion among the scholars. They differ also as to whether the lay indicates that she and Sigurd plighted troth together, or merely that she bestowed wisdom on him.

The very striking lay called the *Hell-Ride of Brynhild* is also a favorite battle-ground of the critics. After her death and Sigurd's and their burning on the funeral pyre, "Brynhild drave in her chariot down along the way to Hell, and passed by an abode where dwelt a certain giantess, and the giantess spake,"[1] and reproached her with following the husband of another, and with having caused the death of men. Brynhild, to justify herself, relates the story of her life and wrongs. According to this version, she is the daughter of Budli, a maiden fond of war. But she is also a valkyrie, who disobeyed Odin by giving victory in battle to Aud's brother, instead of to the old Hjalmgunnar. At this point occurs a strophe (No. 6) which is given very different meanings in the different translations. According to one widely accepted version, it explains Brynhild's reason for giving victory to Aud's brother, Agnarr.[2] She, as valkyrie, had also the characteristics of a swan maiden, and when Agnarr stole her swan dress, which she had laid aside under an oak-tree, she was in his power, and was forced to promise him victory in battle. Other scholars consider that the lines say nothing at all about Agnarr or swan garments, interpreting them variously as referring to her life with Heimi, her early betrothal to Sigurd, Odin's placing her under her shield in slumber, or otherwise. It is apparently impossible to decide whether or no Brynhild was forced to aid Agnarr by this ruse of the usual swan-maiden story. It seems probable, however, that she did not, as is sometimes asserted, betroth herself to him.[3]

Whatever the cause of her disobedience, in punishment there for, as the lay goes on to tell us, Odin shut her within a shield wall, surrounded by fire, and decreed that he alone should break her slumber who knew no fear and who brought the gold guarded

[1] Magnusson and Morris, p. 197. [2] Gering, p. 239. [3] Boer, *op. cit.*, p. 314.

by Fafnir. There now seems to be a strange jump or gap in the narrative. The hero's breaking through the fire and awakening her is not mentioned, but the scene shifts abruptly from the realm of gods and magic fire to the house of Heimi, Brynhild's foster-father. "Then upon Grani rode the goodly gold-strewer to where my fosterer ruled his fair dwelling."[1] This seems, from what follows, to refer to Sigurd's arrival in Gunnar's form. They are betrothed, but *not* united in wedlock. Later Gudrun reproaches her with having "slept in the arms of Sigurd;" and then Brynhild knows that they have tricked her in the betrothal, and have given to her "a loveless life, a life of lies." She seems to feel that Sigurd was her destined mate and that in dying together they are united for eternity.

This puzzling lay therefore shows Brynhild both as a valkyrie surrounded by fire and as a human princess under Heimi's fostering care. The man who wins her must ride the fire, but his riding of it is not narrated. Only one meeting with Sigurd is told of[2]—when he wins her for Gunnar at Heimi's and keeps faith with his brother. It is Gudrun who reveals the deception. We can venture, I think, to suggest that this lay shows an imperfect blending of the two forms—the disobedient valkyrie to be awakened by the hero who passes the fire, and the mortal princess won by trickery for another. The gap where the two are joined seems apparent. But it is, of course, always possible that some strophes have dropped out.

We come now to a lay which, though not admirable as a literary production, is very interesting in the development of the legend—the *Lay of Gripir*.[3] Sigurd is here supposed to visit his uncle Gripir, who foretells to him all the events of his life, in that distressingly undramatic fashion of which the prophecy-loving Norse poets seem very fond. According to Gripir's narrative, frequently interrupted by Sigurd's questions and comments, the hero awakes, by slitting her hauberk with his sword, a king's daughter asleep on a mountain, surrounded by flames. She teaches him wisdom.

[1] Magnusson and Morris, p. 200.

[2] Unless we interpret Strophe 6 as alluding to an early betrothal with Sigurd. See above, p. 8, and Boer, *op. cit.*, p. 315.

[3] *Corpus Poeticum Boreale*, Vol. I, pp. 285 ff.

Sigurd then goes to Heimi's and there falls in love with that lord's foster-daughter, Brynhild, the daughter of Budli. They plight troth. He next visits Giuki's, where by the old queen Grimhild's magic craft he is made to forget Brynhild. When offered Gudrun for his wife, Sigurd assumes Gunnar's form and obtains for him Brynhild, keeping faith with his brother in wooing her. Afterward the Volsung remembers the past, but he can do nothing to remedy matters, and "he does not begrudge Gudrun her luck"—an interesting touch. In revenge for the wrong done her, Brynhild persuades Gunnar that Sigurd broke faith with him in the wooing, and Giuki's sons slay the hero. It is interesting to note that Sigurd, on hearing this prophecy, expresses the deepest horror at his base treachery to Brynhild; but his uncle endeavors to cheer him by the assurance that it will be all Grimhild's fault; Sigurd himself will not be to blame.

In this plot, of which the lay gives only a rather bare outline, several things are striking: the sleeping fire-girt maiden, who merely gives Sigurd wisdom, is distinguished from Budli's daughter Brynhild, the foster-child of Heimi; Sigurd and Brynhild meet, love, and plight troth before he goes to Giuki's; he is made by magic to forget her before he wins her for Gunnar. Save for the distinction between Brynhild and the sleeping maiden, in this lay the story closely approximates its final form.

Besides occasional references, we find in the Eddic lays one other version of the Brynhild legend, given incidentally in the *Lament of Oddrun*.[1] Brynhild is referred to as a valkyrie and as a king's daughter fond of war. She sits in her bower embroidering when Sigurd first approaches her hall. Then there is an attack on her castle and she is won. Not long afterward she learns of the "wiles" and takes dreadful vengeance. Finally she kills herself because of the death of Sigurd. These hazy references seem to point to a version somewhat different from those of the other lays. The embroidery scene suggests the setting of Sigurd's second meeting with Brynhild as it is found in the *Völsunga Saga*.

Without pretending to side with any one theory of the inter-

[1] Magnusson and Morris, p. 258.

pretation of these lays, it seems possible to state a few general conclusions about the questions in dispute. As for Brynhild's identity, whatever this may have been in the original and essential kernel of the story, it seems that several different elements—we will not say different personalities or individuals—ultimately combined in her figure. There was the mortal maiden fond of war, as she appears in chronicles of old Germanic times, when, among a war-loving people, even maidens sometimes donned helmet and hauberk and tasted of the joys of battle.[1] There appears also the idea of her fierce aversion to wedlock. At some time there certainly entered in the Norse conception of the valkyrie: the maiden riding through the air and hovering over the battlefields, possessed of supernatural powers of prophecy and allotment of fate in war; sometimes in the service of Odin, carrying out his will in battle and bearing the dead heroes to Valhalla. And possibly there were introduced also the "swan maiden" characteristics which every valkyrie was supposed to have, for a valkyrie was a swan maiden and something more.[2] The Norse mind does not seem to have objected to combining in the same person a mortal king's daughter and a valkyrie. Sigrun also, in the *Helgi Lays*, is both.

As for Brynhild's relations with Sigurd, it is certain that at some time the hero did wake a sleeping, fire-girt maiden, whoever she may originally have been—i. e., we find the "sleeping beauty" motive. And he did win by deceit for another a king's daughter. Whether original or not in the tale, there entered in at some time the idea of his previous betrothal to this maiden. But there is nothing in the existing lays to indicate that she and Sigurd were ever united in wedlock. And the strongest emphasis is laid, again and again, on the fact that he kept faith with his brother in the wooing. Finally, it is clear that in revenge and jealousy Brynhild caused Sigurd's death. The problem as to the precise order in which these various elements were combined, and the

[1] E. Mogk, on "Mythology," in Paul's *Grundriss*, Vol. I, p. 1014.

[2] On valkyries and swan maidens, see E. Mogk in Paul's *Grundriss*, Vol. I, pp. 1014 ff., 1023 ff., 1026, 1027; and a somewhat different account in Simrock, *Deutsche Mythologie*, pp. 359 ff.

precise time when the combinations took place, seems insoluble and on the whole unimportant.

It is more interesting to banish from our minds these theories and analyses and to consider the literary effect in the *Edda* of the figure of Brynhild, or of Brynhild *plus* Sigrdrifa. In the lays which have survived Brynhild does not appear as a valkyrie in action, but in the *Helgi Lays*[1] we find what was a Norse poet's conception of this splendid product of the northern imagination. Since this seems to have influenced later portrayals of Brynhild, it is worth citing here. The valkyrie Sigrun, also a king's daughter and faithful to her love even beyond the grave, is portrayed as hovering in the air over her betrothed, saving him from the storm on the sea and protecting him in battle on land. The description of her first appearance to him gives the keynote which Wagner elaborated in his valkyries. After Helgi has fought a battle—

> Then over Lowefell there burst flashes of light, and out of the flashes the lightnings leapt. . . . . Then appeared high in air a troop of maidens, riding in the field of Heaven; they wore helmets, and their mail coats were flecked with blood, and from their spear-points light-beams shone. It was early when the king called out of Wolfwood to the maids of the South, and asked them if they would follow him home that night—there was a clang of bowstrings. But Hogni's daughter answered from where she sat on her steed—the shield-clash lulled.[2]

When Brynhild first appears to us she has lost her valkyrie-ship; but we are compensated by the finely imaginative and romantic picture of the maiden sunk in sleep, girt about by the flames which the fearless hero alone can pass. And there is poetry and dignity in her awakening greeting, closely followed by Wagner:

> Hail to the day come back!
> Hail, sons of the daylight![3]

But the chief interest centers in the events following her marriage with Gunnar, especially in the stormy conflict of passions within her breast. There is a marked psychological study. She appears as a character capable of one great, all-mastering

[1] *Corpus Poeticum Boreale*, Vol. I, pp. 129 ff.

[2] *Corp. Poet. Bor.*, Vol. I, p. 133.

[3] Magnusson and Morris, p. 69.

love, and as the type of a woman bitterly wronged, driven on to the catastrophe by love, jealousy, and desire for revenge. Her agony of jealousy is made especially striking by the survival of the fine passage in the *Short Lay of Sigurd:*

Oft with heart deep
In dreadful thoughts,
O'er ice-fields and ice-hills
She fared a-night time,
When he and Gudrun
Were gone to their fair bed,
. . . . . .
"Ah! now the Hun King
His queen in arms holdeth,
While love I go lacking,
And all things longed for,
With no delight
But in dreadful thought."
These dreadful things
Thrust her toward murder.[1]

Driven on by jealousy and her sense of wrong, she obtains a bloody revenge. She even insists on the death of Sigurd's young son. And when Sigurd is slain and Gudrun laments her dead lord, she feels in her triumph a strange and terrible joy.

Then laughed Brynhild,
Budli's daughter,
Once, once only,
From out her heart;
When to her bed
Was borne the sound
Of the sore greeting
Of Giuki's daughter.[2]

Sigurd she loved with a passionate and immutable love, deeming them fated to each other.

For myself had I given
To that great king
Who sat amid gold
On the back of Grani . . . .
One I loved,
One, and none other.[3]

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 178, 179.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 185.
[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 187, 188.

But he was cut off from her in this life by his marriage to another. She proudly protests,

> Far be it from me,
> Feeble and wavering,
> Ever to love
> Another's love—.[1]

The one solution is death, the one escape from the "loveless life, the life of lies," wrought for her by the sons of Giuki—death for Sigurd in expiation of the wrong done her, death for herself that she may follow him to the other world and be united with him forever. She feels pride in her faithfulness to her love, and disparages Gudrun in comparison:

> More seemly for Gudrun
> Your very sister,
> In death to wend after
> Her love first wed;
> Had but good rede
> To her been given,
> Or if her heart
> Had been like to my heart.[2]

The narrative of her end, as she follows her love in death, is pitched in a key of lofty and tragic dignity: her request that she and Sigurd may be burned together on the funeral pyre, with his sword between them; her proud justification of her acts to the "giant woman" as she drives in her chariot down along the way to Hell.

Of a softer side of her nature we see nothing. To the other characters, and to the poet himself—or poets—she seemed, one feels, a terrible and mysterious person, ill-fated, almost supernatural. She appears so even to Gunnar, who loves her passionately. When she laughs at Sigurd's death, he cries:

> Whereas thou laughest,
> O hateful woman,
> Glad on thy bed,
> No good it betokeneth:
> Why lackest thou else

[1] *Loc. cit.*, p. 188. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 193, 194.

Thy lovely hue?
Feeder of foul deeds,
Fey do I deem thee.[1]

The people wonder at her, when she laments after Sigurd's death.

All kept silence
After her speaking,
None might know
That woman's mind,
Or why she must weep
To tell of the work
That laughing once
Of men she prayed.[2]

The poet portrays her in wild and terrible fashion:

By a pillar she stood
And strained its wood to her;
From the eyes of Brynhild,
Budli's daughter,
Flashed out fire,
And she snorted forth venom,
As the sore wounds she gazed on
Of the dead-slain Sigurd.[3]

Gudrun and her waiting women curse her as the cause of so many woes.[4] The giant woman reproaches her with having brought about the death of men.[5] Hogni, when begged by Gunnar to prevent her suicide, protests,

Nay, let hard need
Have rule thereover,
And no man let her
Of her long journey!
Never born again,
May she come back thence!

Luckless she came
To the lap of her mother,

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 185.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 206.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 121.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 120.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 198.

Born into the world
For utter woe,
To many a man
For heart-whole mourning.[1]

The loneliness of her position accentuates the tragic effect. She stands utterly alone, understood and sympathized with by no one, with affection only from the husband whom she can never love, and who is himself one of the chief causes of her woe.

Gloom enwraps her figure, and the feeling of the terrible power of Fate, in which mankind is helpless. Even Brynhild seems to believe that the men who have wronged her are not altogether to blame; all are swept on together by the irresistible might of a cruel Fate. She laments

The dread Norns wrought for us
A long while of woe.[2]

She prophesies of Oddrun to Gunnar,

And she shall love thee
As I had loved thee,
If in such wise
Fate had willed it.[3]

Death, Brynhild seems to feel, is man's one avenue of escape from the cruelties of Fate. And in her last words to the giant woman there is a note of triumph:

Ah! for unrest
All too long
Are men and women
Made alive!
Yet we twain together
Shall wear through the ages,
Sigurd and I.—
Sink a-down, O giant-wife.[4]

Such is the figure of Brynhild as she appears in the surviving lays of the *Elder Edda*. But the complete Norse conception of her can be obtained only when we add to these poems a study of the *Völsunga Saga*. This prose version of the tale was "composed probably some time in the twelfth century, from floating

[1] *Loc. cit.*, p. 189.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 178.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 193.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 201.

traditions, no doubt; from songs which, now lost, were then known, at least in fragments, to the Sagaman; and finally from the songs which, written down about his time, are still existing."[1] In the chapters of the Saga covered by the poems which have survived, we can see that the author of the prose was paraphrasing his originals closely. We can reasonably assume that his other chapters were, for the most part, based closely on lays no longer in existence. And we must bitterly regret this loss, for, fine as the prose is, it lacks some of the splendor and intensity of the Eddic poetry. The episodes which we obtain only from the Saga comprise the most dramatic portion of the tale: Sigurd's visit to Hlymdale, Heimi's home, and his second meeting with Brynhild there; Gudrun's prophetic dream and her visit to Brynhild to hear its interpretation; Sigurd's arrival at Giuki's hall and the magic potion given him by Grimhild, the old queen, to make him forget his first love; his wedding with Gudrun; his second riding of the flames, in Gunnar's form, to win the maiden for his brother; Brynhild's marriage with Gunnar; Sigurd's returning memory of the past, but inability to alter the situation; the quarrel between the queens, when Gudrun reveals to Brynhild the deception practiced on her; the agony and wrath of Brynhild and the great scene between her and Sigurd. All these, though there are allusions to many of them in the lays, are found in full only in the Saga.

For all this we owe the Sagaman an immense debt of gratitude; but we can scarcely credit him with a unifying imagination or constructive art. He seems to have merely patched the lays together, without much effort to make the story unified and consistent. He even left in manifest contradictions. Brynhild's account to Gunnar,[2] for example, of the events connected with her marriage is inconsistent with the story as given in the preceding chapters.

As for the mooted point of Brynhild's identity, though the Sagaman identifies the disobedient valkyrie, sleeping on the mountain and awakened by Sigurd, with Brynhild, Budli's daughter, the "shield-maiden" fond of war, he does not make

[1] *Ibid.*, p. xl. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 102, 103.

of her a clear or consistent figure. According to his account Sigurd and Brynhild plight troth on the mountain Hindfell, after she is awakened and gives him wisdom. Then she goes to Hlymdale, to her foster-father, Heimi, and sits in her bower among her maidens. Here, in curious contrast to her acknowledged fierce fondness for life on the battlefield, she displays quite a feminine domesticity. "She could more skill in handycraft than other women," and "sat overlaying cloth with gold and sewing thereon the great deeds which Sigurd had wrought—the slaying of the Worm, and the taking of the wealth of him, and the death of Regin withal."[1] To Hlymdale comes Sigurd on a visit, and chancing to pursue his hawk up a high tower he there sees a fair woman, and he knows that it is Brynhild, and "he deems all things he sees there to be worthy together, both her fairness and the fair things she wrought." Now apparently deeply in love with her, he discusses her with Heimi's son, Alswid, who tells of her averseness to the other sex and her fondness for war—but says nothing of her career as a valkyrie, nor of the magic, flame-encircled sleep from which she has presumably just returned. In fact, the valkyrie idea seems to be dropped from Brynhild after her first appearance. In a striking scene she and Sigurd swear to each other love and fidelity, and he gives her a ring—a sort of second betrothal. Brynhild seems throughout the tale to be a person of unsettled residence. Some time after Sigurd's departure, she apparently leaves Hlymdale and re-establishes herself in a flame-encircled hall. And now the fire ride appears as the test which she has imposed on the man who would win her. Gunnar—or rather Sigurd, whom she believes to be Gunnar—appears and demands that she fulfil her pledge to wed him who should ride the flames. One would think that her betrothal to Sigurd, the first rider of the fire, would have absolved her from further obligations of this sort; but she admits Gunnar's claim and yields herself to him. On his departure she returns to Heimi's, and goes thence to Budli's, that her father may bestow her in marriage on Gunnar in conventionally proper style. It is evident that we have in all this a rather careless

[1] *Loc. cit.*, p. 82.

mingling of lays originally composed by various poets, who were dealing with different episodes, versions, and aspects of a great body of tradition.

One striking point in the Saga, seriously affecting the plot, is the introduction of Aslaug, the daughter of Sigurd and Brynhild. This idea seems to be a late invention, inserted for genealogical reasons, perhaps by the compiler of the Saga, who wished to connect the Volsungs with his Aslaug story.[1] There appears to be no other indication that Sigurd and Brynhild were united in wedlock; that the relation between them was more than a betrothal.

But any analysis of the inconsistencies of the plot is a rather thankless task. Read in the proper spirit, the Saga is, after all, very pleasing as it is. On some striking characteristics of Brynhild it throws new light. She is impressive and interesting in the scene with Sigurd in Gunnar's guise, when he has ridden through the flames to her hall and claimed her. "Call thou to mind thine oath," he says, "concerning the riding through of the fire, wherein thou didst swear that thou wouldst go with the man who should do this deed."[2] Brynhild is heavy at heart, having deemed that the feat could be performed only by Sigurd, her "first troth-plight and well-beloved;" but she will not be forsworn. True to her oath, she yields herself to him whom she supposes to be Gunnar, and gives him the ring "Andvari's loom," bestowed on her by Sigurd. Brynhild's strong desire to be faithful to her oath, thus accentuated here, is recurred to later in the story, when she finds that through the trick practiced upon her she has been forced to break her vow and live forsworn.

The great scenes preceding the catastrophe are dramatic in the extreme: the quarrel between the queens, when Gudrun reveals the trick and displays the ring "Andvari's-loom," given her by Sigurd; Brynhild's unrestrained grief; her reproaches to Gunnar and fierce desire to slay him; her jealousy and wrath; above all, the much-praised scene with Sigurd. The Volsung is torn in soul by her anguish, her reproaches, and her determination to die.

[1] See *Corpus Poeticum Boreale*, Vol. I, p. 394, note.

[2] Magnusson and Morris, p. 96.

He excuses himself by the drink of forgetfulness; he offers her all his gold if she will but live; protesting his love for her, he rejoices that they may at least live as friends beneath the same roof; he suggests that they may live as lovers; he offers even to put away Gudrun and wed Brynhild, that she may keep her vow. But if the man is willing to compromise with Fate, not so the woman. Clearly does she seem to see that a shameful wrong cannot be righted by another wrong. "I will not have two kings in one hall," she declares, "I will lay down my life rather than beguile Gunnar the king." Nor will she consent that wrong be done her rival Gudrun. For the sorrow and dishonor in which Fate has entangled them, death is the only remedy. And when Sigurd leaves her he knows, we feel, that the end is near at hand.

There has been considerable discussion of the motives which drove Brynhild to cause Sigurd's death. It has been suggested that, being endowed with divine, prophetic power, she knew beforehand that he was not to be responsible for his acts, and would not have punished him for deeds over which he had really no control. In fact, she admits knowledge of the drink of forgetfulness. Miss Weston, in her *Legends of the Wagner Drama*,[1] following this line of thought, seems to think she had him killed solely because he told Gudrun of the trick. This appears to be a rather quibbling way of regarding the situation. Divine valkyrie though Brynhild was, we should not, I think, take her prophetic power very seriously. Nearly everybody in the Eddic poetry seems to prophesy sooner or later, but this supposed knowledge of the future does not affect any one's actions. It is apparently a mere literary convention, designed to gratify a strange and unhappy taste. Moreover, the drink of forgetfulness would excuse only Sigurd's faithlessness to his first love and marriage with Gudrun. It would not entirely excuse the deceit he practiced when he won Brynhild for Gunnar. And it is the discovery of this trick which apparently enflames her with a desire for vengeance. The Norse poets, however, would probably not analyze the situation so subtly as modern critics. Nor would revenge by murder seem to them the terrible and unusual thing it is to us.

[1] Pp. 128 and 151.

They probably conceived Brynhild as being very naturally driven on, not by one definite motive, but, as men and women generally are, by a mingling of motives—revenge, jealousy, agony that Sigurd should have given her rival the chance to mock at her, unwillingness to live forsworn a loveless and dishonored life, and, as I have several times suggested, a feeling that, guiltless though Sigurd may be, from the dishonor in which Fate has involved them, death is the only escape. By death alone can they expiate their sins, unwitting though they may have been; by death alone can their love be made again pure and perfect.

"I will not live," says Brynhild to Gunnar, "for Sigurd has bewrayed me, yea and thee no less, whereas thou didst suffer him to come into my bed: lo thou, two men in one dwelling I will not have; and this shall be Sigurd's death, or thy death, or my death; for now has he told Gudrun all, and she is mocking me even now."

With this last very human touch the great chapter closes. In the account of the deaths of the two lovers, the Saga follows the surviving lays.

The atmosphere of gloom which enwraps this old Norse literature, the setting of storms and ice-fields, is in striking contrast to the typical landscape of the mediaeval French romances—the green meadow, fair in the sunshine, the bright flowers, the bubbling spring, the birds singing sweetly in the overhanging branches. Fully as radical is the contrast between the gracious heroine of romance and the tragic, terrible figure of Brynhild, with her fierce passion, her loyalty to her oath, her "northern pride of purity," her determination to love with honor or to die.

Any study of the origin of the Volsung or Niblung legend would, of course, necessitate a careful consideration of the *Thidreksaga*, for this is supposed to throw much light on the early German form of the story. But in the literary development of the character of Brynhild the *Thidreksaga* seems unimportant, and it may be omitted here. The later German version of the tale, however, the *Nibelungenlied*, written about 1200, is too important a literary monument to be passed over.

This hybrid composition, strange mingling of epic plot and

romance setting, is in nothing more unfortunate than in its portrayal of Brünhilt. In interest and in dignity she falls far below the Norse character. The poet does not seem to have been attracted by her—small wonder, considering the material he had—and he treats her with little sympathy. His interest centers on other points in the tale.

As she appears in the *Nibelungenlied*, she is no divine valkyrie, nor is she exactly a mortal "shield-maiden." She is queen of "Issland," dwelling at her castle of "Isenstein," "passing fair" but a lady of decidedly Amazonian tendencies, showing traces of supernatural characteristics by the possession of the strength of a dozen men. She will wed only the man who can surpass her in throwing the spear, hurling the stone, and leaping—rather prosaic equivalents for the fire ride. And if the candidate fails in but one, he loses his head.

Her relations with Siegfried are somewhat puzzling. So far as the poem tells us, she never loves him, nor he her. The poet, we feel, knew of no love between them. But there are some indications that in an earlier version the two did meet and love before Siegfried won her for Gunther:[1] the fact, for example, that Siegfried is familiar with the route to her court and the customs there, and knows her by sight; and her tears when she sees him sitting by Kriemhilt's side. But save for these vague relics, the love between the two has quite dropped out of the poem as it stands. It is scarcely necessary to point out the immense change in the plot and the loss of dramatic interest which this produces. The illustrious pair, united for eternity in the Norse saga, are here never united at all.

Siegfried's successful trickery in winning her for Gunther evidently gratified the poet extremely, and he narrates it with unction, never suggesting that it was at all dishonorable. Journeying to Isenstein as Gunther's pretended vassal, Siegfried aids his prospective brother-in-law to win the Amazonian maid. Rendered invisible by the "tarn kappe" he makes it appear that Gunther has won in the contests, and Brünhilt is forced to wed the Burgundian

[1] E. Mogk, *op. cit.*, asserts that they have met and loved. See a full discussion of the evidence in the poem in Lichtenberger, *op. cit.*, pp. 158 ff.

king. This does not seem to improve her disposition. When Gunther refuses to tell her at once why he gave his sister in marriage to Siegfried, whom Brünhilt believes to be his vassal, she declines to abide by her word and refuses to live in wedlock with her husband. One can hear the old-time audience chuckling at the rude humor of her hanging Gunther on the nail to suffer through an uncomfortable night, and rejoicing when this unfeminine rebellion is brutally punished in the unpleasant episode where Siegfried, again assuming the tarn kappe, subdues her for her husband. The whole proceeding certainly reflects no credit on any of the characters concerned.

In striking contrast to the course of events in the Norse legend, in the *Nibelungenlied* Brünhilt is *not* the instigator of Siegfried's murder. It is interesting to note the "feudalization" of the story, especially at this point, the substitution of feudal motives for the passions which govern the Norse characters. Siegfried has indiscreetly boasted to his wife of his conquest of Brünhilt for Gunther. Consequently, when, after many years, Brünhilt taunts Kriemhilt with having wedded her brother's vassal, the latter retorts by accusing Brünhilt of having had Siegfried as a lover. Thus learning of the trick played upon her, and incensed that Siegfried should have boasted of it, Brünhilt loudly laments in wounded pride. Gunther is contented with having Siegfried swear that he never declared he had been Brünhilt's lover. But Hagen, the faithful vassal, learning of Siegfried's supposed boast, loyally determines to revenge the insult offered to his liege lady. Hagen it is, then, who finally persuades Gunther to assent to the plan and bring about Siegfried's death.

Under these circumstances there is, of course, no reason for Brünhilt's following the Volsung into the other world. She comes to no tragic end, but lives on. From the moment when Hagen determines on Siegfried's death, save for a few unimportant allusions she fades from the story.

In her figure as it appears here there is none of the dignity, the nobility, the lofty pride of the Norse Brynhild. She is not torn by the great, elemental passions which make Budli's daughter a real and moving figure for all time. Small wonder that later

poets have neglected the *Nibelungenlied*, and turned for inspiration to the northern legend.

In the great nineteenth-century versions of the Volsung legend, both following more or less closely the Norse form, Brynhild comes into her own. Psychologically perhaps the most interesting person in the story, and winning sympathy through her wrongs and undeserved suffering, she is to the modern mind an attractive and moving figure. Of Wagner's and Morris' great poems, Morris' *Sigurd the Volsung* adheres more closely to the Norse version and may best be considered first.

For the most part Morris follows reverently the course of events narrated in the *Völsunga Saga*, elaborating them in description, character-drawing, and accessory incidents. He has, however, tried to simplify and unify Brynhild's figure. He has cut out her relationship with Budli and Atli and the complications which that involves. She remains a mortal princess, sister-in-law of Heimir, chosen by Odin as a valkyrie, and plunged in sleep in punishment for her disobedience in choosing the victors in battle. Here, too, the magic fire surrounds her to keep away all save the destined fearless hero. But there still remains in the story much of the puzzling obscurity about her various residences, her return to the fire, and the nature of her oath as to the fire ride, which we noted in the *Völsunga Saga*. Here, too, after the opening scene, her valkyrie nature seems to vanish. She is not a supernatural person; she has, happily, lost her prophetic power; she is merely a wise woman, and, above all, a great queen.

The general softening of her character in accordance with nineteenth-century ideals is especially noticeable. She is no longer a grim and terrible figure. Next after the "golden Sigurd" himself she seems the favorite of the author. He represents her always as very beautiful—"exceeding glorious,"[1] "the fairest of all things fashioned."[2] Her manners are always the perfection of dignified courtesy. In the two love scenes with Sigurd she is tender, loving, and womanly. Her passions are not fierce, revengeful, and unrestrained: she does not try to kill Gunnar in her agony; she does not cause the death of Sigurd's young son; as

[1] *Sigurd the Volsung*, p. 216. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 227.

the plot is here handled she does not have to insist urgently on Sigurd's death, for Gunnar needs no more than a suggestion.

The idea of her fidelity to her oath, found in the Saga, Morris has admirably thrown into relief. Sigurd in Gunnar's form tells her truly, when he demands her hand, "Thou art none of the women that swear and forswear and rejoice."[1] She crushes her sorrow and love for the lost Sigurd, and weds as she believes duty and honor demand. Giving to the "image of Gunnar" Sigurd's gift, "Andvari's ring," she says,

"Lo, here, my gift of the morning! twas my dearest treasure of all,
But thou art become its master, for thee was it foreordained,
Since thou art the man of mine oath and the best that the earth has gained."[2]

But most striking of Brynhild's traits is her dignified and wise self-restraint. She controls her sorrows and her passions, and moves through life with outward calm, performing her duties as a great queen should. This impression Morris has succeeded in developing very happily. It is conveyed especially in a scene the dramatic possibilities of which had been quite passed over in the Norse version—her recognition of the faithless Sigurd when she arrives in the Niblung hall. She has come, in accordance with her promise, to wed Gunnar; with queenly dignity and courtesy she has greeted him, his brother Hogni, and their attendant lords; she enters the hall, and there beside Gudrun sits Sigurd, on whose face she has not looked since he left her long before at Lymdale, with vows of everlasting love.

She stood with her hand in Gunnar's, and all about and around
Were the unfamiliar faces, and the folk that day had found;
But her heart ran back through the years, and yet her lips did move
With the words she spake on Hindfell, when they plighted troth of love.[3]

Sigurd, too, remembers, for the power of the potion has passed, and he is conscious of the treason he has wrought. So they gaze on each other.

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 216. [2] P. 218. [3] P. 226.

Now she stands on the floor of the high-seat, and for e'en so little a space
As men may note delaying, she looketh on Sigurd's face,
Ere she saith:
"I have greeted many in the Niblungs' house today,
And for thee is the last of my greetings ere the feast shall wear away:
Hail, Sigurd, son of the Volsungs! hail, lord of Odin's storm!
Hail, rider of the wasteland and slayer of the Worm!
If aught thy soul shall desire while yet thou livest on earth,
I pray that thou mayest win it, nor forget its might and worth."[1]

Sigurd returns her greeting with equal dignity and with a similar hidden meaning.

She heard and turned unto Gunnar as a queen that seeketh her place.

So she takes up her duties as Gunnar's wife. In the night time, as in the Eddic Lay, she wanders forth from the hall and wrestles with her jealousy. But she has no thought of avenging Sigurd's desertion of her. Calmly she moves through the days with "her fair face never smiling, and eyes that know no change." With most admirable self-restraint she even strives to keep on good terms with Gudrun.

Close now is her converse with Gudrun, and sore therein she strives
Lest the barren stark contention should mingle in their lives;
And she humbles her oft before her, as before the Queen of the earth,
The mistress, the overcomer, the winner of all that is worth:
And Gudrun beareth it all, and deemeth it little enow
Though the wife of Sigurd be worshipped; and the scorn in her heart doth grow,
Of every soul save Sigurd.[2]

In the quarrel between the queens Gudrun is most to blame. At the sight of Andvari's ring and the revelation of the shameful trick played upon her, Brynhild's outward calm is broken and she is plunged in agony. Of the drink of forgetfulness she evidently knows nothing. She can scarcely comprehend Sigurd's treachery, and strives to believe that it is not so. She implores Gudrun,

"One thing I beseech thee and crave:
That thou speak but a word in thy turn my life and my soul to save:
—Yea the lives of many warriors, and the joy of the Niblung home,

[1] P. 227. [2] P. 229.

And the days of the unborn children, and the health of the days to come—
Say thou it was Gunnar thy brother that gave thee the Dwarf-lord's ring,
And not the glorious Sigurd, the peerless lovely King."[1]

And of Gunnar she begs:

"O tell me, Gunnar," she said, "that thou gavest Andvari's ring
To thy sister the white-armed Gudrun! thou, not thy captain of war,
The son of the God-born Volsungs, the Lord of the treasure of yore!
O swear it that I may live! that I may be glad in thine hall."[2]

When the realization of the truth is forced upon her she feels herself bitterly wronged and dishonored, false to her oath.

"Which one of the sons of Giuki," said Brynhild, "durst to ride
Through the waves of my Flickering Fire to lie by Brynhild's side?
Thou shouldst know him, O Sister of Kings; let the glorious name be said,
Lest mine oath in the water be written, and I wake up, vile and betrayed,
In the arms of the faint-heart dastard, and of him that loveth life,
And casteth his deeds to another, and the wooing of his wife."[3]

These feelings, rather than jealousy, urge her on to the catastrophe. And Morris, in his portrayal of the situation, strives to make her act seem justified. Never is the trick played upon her presented as other than shameful. Sigurd himself is plunged in grief and remorse at the memory of his desertion of her and of the deception he practiced upon her when his mind was clouded by the potion.

Here, as in the Norse version, Brynhild sees that there is but one way out. She soliloquizes:

"O Sigurd, O my Sigurd, what now shall give me back
One word of thy loving-kindness from the tangle and the wrack?
O Norns, fast bound from helping, O Gods that never weep,
Ye have left stark death to help us, and the semblance of our sleep."[4]

The great scene with Sigurd is managed, in general, much as it is in the *Völsunga Saga;* but Morris' handling seems somewhat less effective. The contrast between his elaborate phrasing and the incisive brevity of his original is especially unfortunate here.

[1] P. 236. [2] Pp. 243, 244. [3] P. 238. [4] P. 239.

In the following scene with Gunnar it is not necessary for Morris to present Brynhild as fiercely insisting on Sigurd's death. Gunnar, whose character at this point is rather skilfully managed, is already stirred by jealousy, suspicion, and envy of the Volsung's wealth and power. A word from his wife is sufficient to drive him to the deed.

Sigurd seems to accept as fitting the death which overtakes him.

> "It is Brynhild's deed," he murmured, "and the woman that loves me well;
> Nought now is left to repent of, and the tale abides to tell."[1]

As in the Norse version, Brynhild kills herself, to join her love on the funeral pyre and follow him through the gates of Valhall.

Morris' poem has its faults. His long, dragging line, often clumsy, his frequent archaism and affectation of style, his obscure elaboration of phrasing, his redundancy—all these make him irritating at times. But when one gets used to his mannerisms, numerous virtues appear. He has, after all, the gift of story telling, and an enthusiastic appreciation of the spirit of these northern tales. He gives us many fine lines and imaginative passages—notably his accounts of the mysterious and supernatural episodes, such as the riding of the flames, the effect of the potion on Sigurd's mind, Sigurd's feelings when he changes into Gunnar's form. As for his Brynhild, she is softened and modernized, less torn by passion than the Norse figure, but on a lofty plane, striking especially in the dignity of a great queen.

In 1876, the year in which Morris' *Sigurd* was published, there took place at Bayreuth the first performance of Richard Wagner's great trilogy, *Der Ring des Nibelungen*, which he had begun twenty-six years before. In his expression of the old legend, Wagner of course made use of his new art-form—the music drama. If this had some disadvantages, it had also immense possibilities, for it enabled him to draw upon the combined resources of poetry, music, and the pictorial art of the stage. And by his powerful use of these he has made Brynhild

[1] P. 259.

live for the world as Morris' somewhat ponderous literary epic could never do.

Wagner drew some scenes and suggestions from the *Nibelungenlied* and the *Thidreksaga*, but the main line of his plot from the *Völsunga Saga*, with ideas from the Eddic lays and general Norse mythology. The necessities of the dramatic form of course forced him to modify and rearrange his material. This he did with a free hand. Under his treatment the character of Brünnhilde has gained immensely in unity. We have no longer any complexities of human fathers, foster-fathers, and domineering brothers and varied earthly residences. For the first time in her history, Brünnhilde is definitely placed in the ranks of the gods, as a divine valkyrie, favorite daughter of Wotan. And in all the supernatural glory of such a being she appears in the great opera which bears that name.

His embodiment of the old Norse conception of the valkyrie was probably the greatest triumph of Wagner's creative imagination. If one can temporarily banish his work from one's mind, the difficulty of representing such a figure visibly and audibly before a modern audience seems insuperable. But Wagner's portrayal of the battle-maidens of the air is altogether convincing. The wild, rocky hills, the gloom, the storm, the thunder, lightning flashes from swirling clouds, the maidens glittering in armor, their fierce, high-spirited glee, their wild shouts of greeting and exultation, above all the supernatural effect of the indescribable music, represent to perfection the spirit of the old Eddic lays, and even more.

Brünnhilde is one of these wild sisters. As in no other version of the tale, we see her as a valkyrie in action, and witness the events leading to her disobedience and punishment. It has often been pointed out that her character presents an admirable blending, contrast, and conflict of the divine pride of the goddess with the human emotions of the woman—affection, sympathy, generosity, and passionate love. The idea is prettily expressed in her early scene with Wotan, when, seeing her father in sorrow, she casts aside her valkyrie weapons, helmet, spear and shield, and sinks by his knee with the affectionate sympathy of a

loving daughter. She appears to warn Sigmund of his impending death in the solemn and awful dignity of a messenger from the gods. But her divine calm melts at the despair of the Volsung, and in a transport of generous sympathy she endeavors to save his life, though she must in so doing disobey her father's command. Her pity for the unfortunate Sieglinde and self-sacrificing efforts in her behalf are among the most moving episodes in the story. In the great scene with Wotan, before he leaves her in slumber, surrounded by the magic fire, she pleads her cause with touching dignity. Her horror at the mortal wedlock to which he has condemned her, her proud prayer that at least her slumber may be surrounded by such dangers that no coward may win her for his wife, her final rush to her father's arms—all this is a happy blending of the human and the divine. Again in the awakening scene with Siegfried, appears her proud unwillingness to stoop to the lot of a mere mortal woman, yielding place at last to the exultation of passionate love and utter surrender to the young hero. Even to avert the fall of all the gods, she will not give up the ring which is his marriage gift. It is noticeable that in Wagner's version, unlike most of the others, Siegfried and Brünnhilde are actually united in wedlock.

Wagner's arrangement of the plot necessitates another considerable change in Brünnhilde's character. The motive of her fidelity to the oath which she had sworn to wed the man who should pass the fire is no longer present. She weds Siegfried, the predestined awakener. When he goes forth to seek fresh glory, she remains on her fire-girt rock awaiting his return. When she hears his horn and springs forward to meet him, only to see suddenly against the flames the dark form of a stranger—perhaps the most dramatic moment in the trilogy—no oath constrains her to yield herself to him. She greets him with horror, and submits only to force, when he tears from her the ring. There is some loss in the dropping of the older idea, but much gain. The plot certainly becomes simpler and more logical.

This change and the necessary compression of events also alter the succeeding scene. Brünnhilde does not come to Gunther's hall voluntarily, bound by her oath. She is led thither by Gun-

ther, an unwilling captive, pale and sad amid the splendidly barbaric greeting of the vassals. The culmination of the tragedy has to follow at once. Her horror at the sight of the still unconscious Siegfried smiling by Gutrune's side; her pathetic cry, "Siegfried . . . . kennt mich nicht?" her realization, at the sight of the ring on his finger, that it was he who obtained her for Gunther; her instant and fierce accusation of him; his innocently perjured oath on the spear point; her passionate contradiction—all make a scene of extraordinary dramatic power. It would be hard to find a more striking portrayal of the wrath and indignation of a woman bitterly wronged.

The necessary compression of the story at this point forced Wagner to omit some admirable portions of the Saga, such as Brynhild's great scene with Sigurd. Her psychology is different here. Without much chance for analyzing her motives, she is hurried on to the catastrophe. Maddened by the sudden revelation of Siegfried's faithlessness and treachery, of the cause of which she is ignorant, she consents to plot his death with Hagen. Of course it is too much to expect that Brünnhilde should submit not only to Siegfried's deserting her for Gutrune, but also to his actually obtaining her by trickery for another man. This was really the last straw, especially for the proud nature of a valkyrie. And yet—and yet— Somehow it is hard for us to feel, nowadays, that one is justified under *any* circumstances in planning to have one's lover stabbed in the back. And when we actually see and hear Brünnhilde doing it, it is rather distressing. Wagner might have managed this more happily.

But she redeems herself in the last scene, when, having learned of Siegfried's innocence, she joins him in death. The fierce valkyrie nature breaks forth at the very last, when with the old cry of exultation she leaps upon Grani's back and plunges into the burning pyre.

Wagner has chosen to represent in Brünnhilde the triumph of love, the supremacy of which she proclaims at the end. By her last sacrifice the curse on the gold is expiated, and a new and happier era dawns. I doubt if one person in fifty gets any such idea from the drama. It is not for his philosophy that we go to

hear Wagner's works, nor for her allegorical significance that we value Brünnhilde.

With all its faults, the trilogy of the *Ring* is the greatest embodiment of the old tale. More fortunate than the Arthurian legend, the Volsung story has found artistic expression in a work of the first rank. In the portrayal of Brünnhilde's character Wagner was especially happy. He avoided here his worst fault, for she is never tiresomely loquacious, except perhaps in her last scene. She is more passionate and unrestrained, less modern, than Morris' Brynhild. And in her union of divine loftiness with the emotions of a noble woman, she seems to be, among all Wagner's characters, his greatest creation—a figure "exceeding glorious."

VIRGINIA C. GILDERSLEEVE

NEW YORK

MUSICAL ACCENT AND DOUBLE ALLITERATION IN THE *EDDA*

In Paul and Braune's *Beiträge*, XXXIII, pp. 95 ff., there appeared an article by B. Q. Morgan, "Zur Lehre von der Alliteration in der Westgermanischen Dichtung."[1] This is an investigation of the relation between the alliteration and the musical accent of the line. The author finds from a study of *Beowulf* that each half-line contains a leading musical pitch which he designates as "führton." By this is not meant any fixed musical note, but a pitch which is to be determined separately for each line by the reader's natural feeling. If two accented syllables in the same half-line have the same "führton," i. e., if they are on the same musical pitch, he calls them "gleichtonig." Any tone which varies from the "führton" he calls "ausweichton" and distinguishes two degrees of the same, "nahton" and "fernton," according to the remoteness from the "führton." Morgan deduces from his results the following rule: "Hebungen mit führton müssen alliterieren, hebungen mit nahton dürfen alliterieren, müssen es aber nicht; hebungen mit fernton sind von der alliteration mit hebungen anderer tonstufe ausgeschlossen." This new rule is intended to supplement or even supersede the old rule of rhythmical stress accent laid down by Sievers (*Altgermanische Metrik*, § 30, 1).

It is not my purpose to try either to verify or to disprove any part of Morgan's work, which seems to be a very accurate and painstaking investigation. But I have been interested in seeing whether his rule can be applied to the North Germanic poetry; and for this purpose I have read the *Vǫlospǫ*, *Thrymskviða*, *Hymeskviða*, and *Baldrs Draumar*, trying in the case of each half-line to see whether, according to my natural feeling, the two accented syllables were on the same musical pitch or not; and this entirely regardless of whether they were first-half or second-half

[1] A paper on the same subject was read by Morgan before the Modern Language Association in Columbus, O., on December 28, 1907.

lines, or whether the alliteration was single or double. I must confess that I am a little skeptical about a study of this kind, particularly if one starts out with a preconceived opinion as to the intonation with which a certain line ought to be read. It seems that some lines can be read (always of course in the context) on either a high or a low equal pitch ("gleichton"), or even with a varying pitch ("ausweichton"), and one about as naturally as another.

Again, it is not always easy for the ear to detect whether two syllables are on the same pitch or no; sometimes a strong stress accent can be mistaken for a change of pitch, when on more careful examination it will turn out that such is not the case; similarly, the inflection of the voice on an unaccented syllable of a polysyllabic word is often misleading, in cases where the two accented syllables of the half-line are on the same pitch. Those lines which seemed capable of two or more intonations I have studied carefully, called in the help of another, and have tried always to decide in favor of the reading which seemed most natural. Of course it is hard to be natural when observing oneself so closely. I have set about my task with an entirely unprejudiced mind, or if anything, rather with the expectation that my results would agree with Morgan's.

He finds that of the 1,542 first half-lines in *Beowulf* which show double alliteration 1,486 are on the same musical pitch; that of the 1,582 first half-lines with single alliteration 1,550 are not on the same pitch; furthermore, of the last half-lines (in which, as is known, there is always only one alliterating word) he finds only 42 which can be read on the same pitch. These proportions are of course sufficient to justify him in deducing his rule that accented syllables of the same pitch can alliterate, others not. The following are my results for the *Vǫlospǫ*. (I omitted those strophes which contain only a list of proper names, and repeated lines were counted only once.) Of the 195 first half-lines in which the two arses are on the same pitch, only 78 have double alliteration, and of the 30 with varying pitch, 17 have also double alliteration. Thus it will be seen that here only 40 per cent. of the lines with "gleichton" show double alliteration, whereas nearly

56 per cent. of those with "ausweichton" also have double alliteration. On the other hand, I find that 77 per cent. of the last half-lines are to be read with "gleichton" of the two stressed syllables. I do not mean to assert that the converse of Morgan's rule will apply to the *Edda*, but only that these figures do not permit its application to this poem at least. And of course I have the same right to suppose that my natural intonation of these lines will coincide with that of most readers, as has Morgan to make this supposition for *Beowulf*.

The figures in the case of the other poems are in some respects even more extreme than for the *Vǫlospǫ*. In the *Thrymskviða*, of the 77 first half-lines with even pitch, only 19 have double alliteration, i. e., only 24 per cent.; and of the 30 with varying pitch 5 have double alliteration. On the other hand, in the last half-lines I read with even pitch 65 of the 107, or over 60 per cent. (here again lines repeated in the poem were counted only once).[1]

As regards those lines not on an even pitch and yet with double alliteration, it might be suggested by someone that the the difference in pitch is not so great as to preclude the alliteration. But I have not been able to carry out Morgan's distinction between "nahton" and "fernton," and furthermore, I am of the opinion that a very great degree of difference in pitch would not prevent alliteration. This is certainly true of alliteration between half-lines. Very often the alliterating word of the second half-line is clearly far removed in pitch from that of the first half-line. And it is this variation in pitch between the half-lines and adjoining full-lines rather than the variation within the half-line, that keeps the reading from being monotonous. Morgan says on p. 97: "Es scheint aber, als lägen auch die führtöne der beiden halbzeilen

[1] *Hymeskviða;* First half-line with even pitch, 109, with uneven pitch, 43; second half-line with even pitch, 96, with uneven pitch, 56; even pitch and double alliteration, 40; uneven pitch and double alliteration, 22.

Baldrs Draumar: First half-line with even pitch, 40, with uneven pitch, 11; second half-line with even pitch, 38, with uneven pitch, 13; even pitch and double alliteration, 10; uneven pitch and double alliteration, 0.

It did not seem advisable or necessary to burden this short article with a list of all of the lines, indicating the musical accent of each. If anyone should desire the figures they can be had upon request. I believe that anyone who will experiment for himself with a few strophes of these poems will notice that a majority of the half-lines are read with even pitch of the arses, regardless of double alliteration.

eines langverses innerhalb derselben zone." I have not tested this for *Beowulf*, but it does not seem to hold good generally for these poems of the *Edda*. On the contrary, a marked difference in the pitch of the alliterating words of the two half-lines would be quite parallel to a strong stress-accent, i. e., it would make the words stand out clearly in the general intonation of the whole line and render them particularly suitable for bearing the alliteration. E. g., str. 17 of the *Thrymskv:*

Mik mono æsir | argan kalla.

the voice rises for the word "argan." Here, as generally, the musical and stress-accents fall on the same word, "argan," and the former simply accentuates the latter. There are half-lines, however, in which the alliterating word is followed by one which bears a stronger stress accent, e. g.:

Thrymskv. 5: þá fló Loki | fjaðrhamr dunþe,
Thrymskv. 15: bindom Þór þá | brúþar líne,
Thrymskv. 30: bereþ inn hamar | brúþe at vígja.

In these lines the nouns "Loki," "Þór," and "hamar" have according to the sense a stronger rhythmical accent, but the preceding alliterating verbs have a much higher musical pitch; and in each case the alliterating word of the second half-line lies on a very low pitch. It seems that this very difference in musical accent is the element which satisfied the poet's feeling for the alliteration. Or perhaps we shall have to say that the high musical pitch added to whatever stress-accent the word has in the line would be sufficient to make this word stand out more prominently than the word with the stronger stress-accent.[1]

Is it not true then that in some cases in the *Edda* there seems to be a relation between alliteration and change of pitch, rather than as Morgan finds for *Beowulf*, between alliteration and "gleichton"? At any rate the Norse poets do not seem to have felt that every pair of equal musical pitches had to alliterate, nor on the other hand that words of a different pitch could not be thus joined together. His statement (p. 98) that: "ist der tonabstand

[1] Cf. J. W. Bright, *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, Vol. XIV, new series, Vol. VII, 1899, pp. 345 ff.

zweier hebungen sehr gross, so wäre deren bindung durch alliteration geradezu stilwidrig, weil diese gewaltsam zusammenbringen würde, was sonst getrennt ist," cannot, I believe, be applied to the *Edda*.

As to the verse types, Morgan thinks that he can find in the musical accent an explanation of the fact that the B and C types so seldom have double alliteration. He says (p. 96), "dass die zweite hebung von B gern im tone ausweicht und bei C fällt der tonsprung zwischen erster und zweiter hebung meist noch viel deutlicher ins ohr." Now in the *Vǫlospǫ* I find that in only 3 of the 39 B-type verses and in only 28 of the 132 C-type verses are the two stresses of the half-line to be read on a different pitch; in by far the larger part then they are on the same pitch. I doubt whether the musical intonation will throw any light on the relation between verse types and double alliteration.

To what is all this difference between the *Beowulf* and the *Edda* to be attributed? Is it due solely to the fact that two persons carried on the investigations? Is this musical intonation purely a personal matter, or is one justified in assuming that most readers will give the lines practically the same musical as well as stress-accent? If the latter be the case then we are confronted with the problem: Why is the number of lines with even pitch so much greater in the *Edda* than in the *Beowulf?* I thought at first that the answer in the case of the *Vǫlospǫ* was to be found in the fact that this whole poem consists of the solemn narrative of the prophetess, in which we might expect to find a high even pitch sustained. But the figures are not materially different for the others, poems full of action. It seems to me that the solution is rather to be sought in the difference in style of *Beowulf* and the *Edda*. As is well known (cf. Sievers, *Altgermanische Metrik*, §30*c*) the running-over of one long line into the next is characteristic of the West Germanic stichic verse. The tendency to end a sentence with the first half-line and begin a new one with the second half-line is very marked in the Anglo-Saxon poetry. The epic variation is one of the most important devices by which the poet maintains this style. If the sentence would naturally end with the long line he carries it over through the

first half of the next line by adding one of those parenthetical or appositional phrases which simply emphasize what has already been said without advancing the narrative.

But in the strophic poetry of the *Edda* the long line developed as the unit, and we generally find the sentence ending with the last half-line, with no pause at all or only a slight one after the first half. The epic variation so common in *Beowulf* is very rare in the *Edda*. The apposition or parallelism which does occur is generally between two long-lines, each being a complete unit. E. g., *Thrymskv.* 14:

Senn vǫro æsir | aller á þinge
ok ǫsynjor | allar á male,

or in Strophe 4:

Møndak gefa þér | þótt ór golle være
ok þó selja | at ór silfre være.

But there is not even a great deal of this sort of variation. The poet does not linger and comment on a situation or an act as in *Beowulf*, but rushes on with his narrative. Now where there is no syntactical break at the end of the first half-line the voice would naturally show a tendency to sustain on the second arsis the pitch of the first in its effort to rush on and finish the sentence:[1] e. g., in *Thrymskv.* 26:

Sat en alsnotra | ambott fyrer,

or Strophe 21:

Senn vǫro hafrar | heim of rekner,

or 16:

Lǫtom und hónom | hrynja lukla,

or 7:

Hefr þu Hlóriþa | hamar of folgenn?

In all these the two stressed syllables of the first half-line seem to be on the same musical pitch. Morgan does not seem to me to

[1] This would also apply to those second half-lines in which the sentence runs over into the following line.

be right when he says of such lines (p. 102): "die leise erregtheit des vortrags hindert den gleichton." Of course some lines of this kind show varying pitch, but this is generally due to some special emphasis of a word, e.g., *Thrymskv.* 10:

seg þú á lopte | lọng tiþende.

Where "lopte" is on a high pitch, the thought being, "tell me while still in the air; do not wait to alight." But these are exceptional cases. In general the pitch of the two stressed syllables will be practically the same. So we may say that if it be true that the *Edda* contains a greater number of half-lines with equal pitch than *Beowulf*, this fact may be due partly to the closer syntactical unity of the full line in the *Edda.*

There is a further explanation of this preponderance of even pitch in the *Edda* (and this will apply to both the first and second half-lines). As remarked above, the musical and stress accents generally coincide, i.e., a stronger stress accent is likely to be accompanied by a change in pitch, generally a rise of the voice; and if the two accented syllables of a half-line have the same stress accent they will generally be on the same pitch. In such cases we have to do with two strongly stressed syllables, and since they must be uttered on some pitch or other, if the two be on the same pitch we are hardly justified in speaking of a musical accent at all, the essential element of which is a change in pitch. Of course it is perfectly plausible to speak of two syllables as being on the same pitch, but this is a statement which one arrives at after it has been observed through a *difference* in the pitch of two syllables that musical accent is something which exists apart from dynamic accent. So long as we deal solely with stressed syllables of the same pitch the idea of a musical accent does not occur to us. In the case of those half-lines, then, in which the two accented syllables are on the same pitch, we can in a certain sense eliminate the conception of a musical accent and say that the dynamic accent predominates.

Now, if it be true that *Beowulf* contains many more half-lines with varying pitch than the *Edda*, i.e., if the musical accent plays a very important rôle in the former, while in the latter the dynamic

accent is the predominating one, this is quite in accord with the characteristic styles of the Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian poetry. Hoffmann ("Der bildliche Ausdruck in *Beowulf* und in der *Edda*," *Englische Studien*, VI, 163–216), was the first to call attention to the fact that the *Beowulf* poet strives constantly to appeal to the emotions of the reader or listener, whereas in the *Edda* the appeal is chiefly to the intellect and the imagination. Now we know (cf. Hempl, *German Orthography and Phonology*, p. 165) that emotion effects a change in the tension of the muscles, which results in a change of the pitch of the voice. Musical accent is the natural accompaniment and symbol of emotional activity. On the other hand, "that idea that most keenly busies the mind is expressed with most vigor, or stress of the voice." Thus stress accent is the natural accompaniment and symbol of mental activity. It is only to be expected then, that in the *Beowulf* the pitch accent would predominate, in the *Edda* the dynamic.

Whatever may be the status of musical accent in the *Beowulf* and in the *Edda*, the fact remains that double alliteration occurs much less frequently in the latter: *Beowulf*, about 50 per cent.; *Vǫlospǫ*, 45 per cent.; *Thrymskv.* 24 per cent.; *Hymis Kviða*, 38 per cent.; *Baldrs Draumar*, 18 per cent.; *Helga Kviða Hundingsbana*, I and II, 25 per cent.; *Rigspula*, 30 per cent.; *Hyndluljoð*, 30 per cent.; *Vǫl en Skamma*, 13 per cent. Only poems in fornyrðislag strophe can well be compared with *Beowulf*. This too may be due partly to the more highly developed unity of the long-line as opposed to the Anglo-Saxon half-line and the running-over of the last half into the first half of the next line. In the *Edda* where the two half-lines are bound closely together syntactically; where the sentence generally begins with the first half-line and ends with the second, and the two half-lines are not separated by any pause or at most by only a slight one, the ear is satisfied by one alliterating word in each half-line. The poet did not feel any great need of a double alliteration. But where, as is frequent in *Beowulf*, the two parts of the long-line are separated by strong punctuation (period, colon, or semicolon, so called "closed" half-lines) and by a marked pause of the voice; where the first half-line is often very closely connected syntacti-

cally with the preceding line and not at all with its own last half-line, then a double alliteration in this first half is almost necessary in order to produce the desired effect for the ear. If the line is split between two sentences then it must be held together more closely by a clear, well-marked alliteration.

This agrees very well with Morgan's figures for *Beowulf*. He finds that 471 of the 646 closed first half-lines show double alliteration, but he associates the phenomenon only with their even pitch. It cannot of course be affirmed that single alliteration occurs only in the open first half-lines and double in the closed (for the *Edda* contains very few closed first half-lines); only that the closed type would be very favorable to the development of double alliteration and the open, on the other hand, would be satisfied with a single. It is true, however, that in the *Edda*, whenever a first half-line is more closely connected grammatically with the preceding line than with its own last half-line, and in the few cases of epic variation we generally find double alliteration. This is particularly noticeable in the *Vǫlospǫ* in which double alliteration is almost as frequent as in *Beowulf*. E.g., Strophe 27:

á sér ausask | aurgom forse,
veþe Valfǫþor. | Vitoþ enn eða hvat?

Strophe 28:

Ein sat úte, | þas aldenn kom
yggjongr asa, | ok í augo leit.

Stophe 32:

Varþ af meiþe, | es mær sýndesk,
harmflaug hættleg; | Hǫþr nam skjóta.

or with epic variation, Strophe 9:

Gengo regen ǫll | á rǫkstóla,
ginnheilog goþ, | ok of þat gættosk:

Let me say again that this article is not intended as a polemic

against Morgan's work. It would in no sense be fair to condemn his work in *Beowulf* by testing his theory on the *Edda*. Nor am I perhaps justified in generalizing for the whole *Edda*, my results obtained from examining only four poems. I only affirm that Morgan's theory of the relation between double alliteration and musical accent cannot be applied generally to Scandinavian alliterative poetry.

C. M. LOTSPEICH

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

MEDIAEVAL LATIN LYRICS

PART IV

APPENDIX[1]

The five methods referred to on page 85 above are as follows:

1. *If a poem appear in an earlier or better text elsewhere than in a German MS, the presumption is that it is of foreign extraction.* The weakness of this method and its attendant dangers are obvious; I have already called attention to them in a discussion of Jeanroy's thesis that French lyrics were the source of German lyrics in the twelfth century (*Modern Philology*, Vol. III, pp. 412 f.). Particular care must be exercised in the application of this chronological test to mediaeval profane songs which in both France and Germany were often not documented until one or more generations after the poems were composed; not written down at least in MSS which have descended to us. Often we owe our knowledge of the existence of profane poetry at a certain time to the merest chance, such as the scribbling of a refrain on a margin of MS to test the scribe's pen before he began an initial, such as a phrase at the heading of a serious piece to give the tune it should be sung by, such as a chance reference in homily or sermon, or a tale like that of the Worcester priest in Gerald's *Gemma ecclesiastica* who said *Swete lemman, dhin are* (sweet mistress, thy favor) instead of the expected *Dominus vobiscum* (*Opera Giraldi*, Vol. II, p. 120; Schofield, *op. cit.*, p. 445; Sandys, *Cambridge Hist. of Eng. Lit.*, Vol. I, p. 219). The age and the provenience of a song can thus be but rarely determined with absolute definiteness.

And as to the "better" text we may not always safely judge. Opinion may differ as to which of two or three texts is best; and if we agree that one form of a poem be preferable, the longest, finest and clearest variant is not necessarily the first one. Quite the contrary often, for we sometimes learn how one poet after another changed and added to a piece until it reached final shape.

2. *If vernacular phrases mingle with the Latin words of a poem, it is probably original in the land whose language these phrases represent.* Here again we cannot attain definite results, particularly in macaronic Middle English lyrics (cf. Wright, *Specimens of Lyric Poetry;* ten Brink,

[1] It is a pleasant duty to acknowledge the vital help and encouragement I have received from Mr. George L. Hamilton, of the University of Michigan, and Mr. Edward K. Rand, of Harvard University. I wish the merit of my performance better justified their kindly offices in its behalf. My colleagues Mr. John M. Manly and Mr. Karl Pietsch have likewise been unfailing in criticism and suggestion.

Gesch. d. engl. Lit., Vol. I², p. 354). At one time, to be sure, all Europe that was ambitious to learn went or longed to go to the French schools, just as later it looked to Italy as the fount of its inspiration. Thus it was possible for an Englishman like Hilary, or a German lad like the author of *Urbs salve regia*, to write a lyric with French words in it or a French refrain to it. At times this song is cut according to the Paris school-jib and perhaps had for its model some French student song; at times the student made a bran-new poem, incorporating in it the personal knowledge and experience gained at the French school, and thus wrote a piece not inherently English or German, but French. Sometimes, however, French words occur in a poem the whole cast of which otherwise is German. Besides which we know that vernacular words were in a few cases inserted in Latin pieces long after they were written. The presence in a song of German or English words indicates nationality more than French words do, for during the whole twelfth century the latter tongue was a sort of *lingua franca* for cultured Europe.

3. *Specific allusion to a country or to its customs and institutions may indicate the original home of a poem.* I have shown with what circumspection this test must be used in my discussion of Nos. 51 and 88 above. Such instances can be multiplied in Latin poems which do not occur in the Benedictbeuern MS; the German's song of farewell to his beloved Swabia, for example, which I have quoted above, p. 24, n. 3, can scarcely be thought of as copied from a French original. In the Germany of the twelfth century, as six hundred years later, Paris was *die haupstadt der welt* and France the fabled land of romance. We should, therefore, expect to hear echoes of this in Latin songs of German manufacture.

4. *The versification of a song may so closely resemble that of a poet or group of poets outside of Germany that the piece can be assigned to them.* Any application of this test must necessarily rest mainly upon the well-known studies in mediaeval Latin rhythms published by Wilhelm Meyer (*Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, 2 vols, 1905). Schreiber first put this method forth to determine which of the Latin songs in the *Carmina burana* were of German origin, in his *Die Vagantenstrophe* (1894). His conception of Latin rhythms was colored by Meyer's essay *über die lateinischen Rythmen* (*Sitzungsber. d. Münchener Akad.*, 1882, I) and Dreves' *Petri Abaelardi hymnarius* (1891), aided here and there by the views of Richard M. Meyer, Martin, Burdach, and Wallensköld. For the sake of discussion I should be willing to accept many of the more general statements of Schreiber about mediaeval lyric measures as true. But when he would apply his results to individual poems in the *Carmina burana* and thus decide which songs are French, which songs German, it is not safe to follow.

For practically every text in the Benedictbeuern MS has to be recon-

structed before its rhythm can be known. Such restored versions are based in nearly every instance at least partly on guesswork—subtle and clever guessing sometimes, but none the less guessing. The foundation of Schreiber's argument is, therefore, at any one moment shaky, often unscientific. The Bacon authorship of Shakespeare can be made many times more plausible than it is if each investigator of the problem be permitted to add and subtract at will. In one poem of five stanzas (No. 109) Schreiber has conjectured the following words: denuo, lepida, victa, feminae, libere, a diis, Taydis, attamen, unico, spatio, oculi, absque te, sine te, mihi nunc, tu, and the inflectional ending -eres. Does the sense require these additions? No; the piece is an intelligible and poetic whole without them. Why did he add them then? In order to get three additional syllables in three verses of each stanza and thus bring the poem up to the form he presupposed. Where did he get these words? Partly from the *Altercatio Ganymedis et Helenae* (*Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XVIII, pp. 127 f.; *Notices et extraits*, Vol. XXIX, Pt. II, pp. 274 f.), partly out of his own head. Is there any proven connection between the *altercatio* and No. 109? No.

Supposing we should thus remold Browning, or Tennyson, trimming them up with chosen bits from Shelley or Coleridge. It makes the perspiration start but to imagine it. What with garbled texts then, and with all reasonable allowance for similarity, coincidence even, of meter and rhythm, I cannot agree to the employment of verse-tests to bring about a final decision as to the origin of a song, in a period where we are still so much in the dark as here.

Schreiber, however, treated only the *vagantenstrophe*. Lundius has come to carry on the verse-test method by examining all the technical details of the Benedictbeuern Latin songs to get criteria to determine their birthplace (*Zeitschr. f. deut. Phil.*, Vol. XXXIX, pp. 330–493). He assumes a time of efflorescence with a certain definite art-technique; this period is one which comprises Adam of St. Victor, Walter of Chatillon, the St. Omer Songs, the poems of the Archpoet, the songs printed by Wright, and the great mass of hymns published by Mone and Dreves! A period, that is, that lasted several hundred years, that stretched from London to Rome and included three or four of the great cultural nations of modern Europe. The art of this period, Lundius states, is marked by several definite characteristics. Where these are deviated from, something is wrong; perhaps the song is German. Exempli gratia, "the art of the period of bloom . . . . strictly preserved the number of syllables in a verse" (p. 335). "On the contrary in the songs of our collection we meet frequently offenses against the syllabic equality of lines. This phenomenon finds a simple explanation if one posits the influence of the German national metrical law as the cause of the disturbance" (p. 461). Forty-

nine pieces are discovered to offend against the law of syllable equality—Lundius declares these pieces German. Likewise, thirty or more of the songs in the *Carmina burana* have especially impure rhyme (p. 476), the rhymes of the St. Omer songs are particularly pure, therefore "impurity of rhyme is a characteristic of German songs." And so on. And so forth.

I am not aiming at Lundius. His performance, or rather the vast detail of it, impresses me somewhat. Verse-tests carried out no more faithfully than his have blazed the way for our understanding of whole sorts and times of poetic effort; Chaucer, for instance, and his relation to fourteenth-century English meters. But we know Chaucer was an Englishman; who and what (man or men) was the Archpoet? We know within narrow compass the dates of Chaucer's writings. When was written "the great mass of hymns published in Mone and Dreves?" What did Walter of Chatillon write? Just the *Alexandreis* and a few stilted narrative poems, or a swarm of songs like those "commonly attributed to Mapes"? And finally, what text of a song may be trusted? That one which Wilhelm Meyer (to name but the great name) has "restored" shortly before he makes a sweeping assertion that "up to now I have found only in Germany Latin songs of the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries with disparate number of syllables"? (*Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, Vol. I, p. 250.)

This tireless investigator has recently extended his study of the syllabic inequality in earlier Latin verses and believes the phenomenon to be caused by the influence of the old German four-stressed line (*Vierheber*); cf. "Ein Merowinger Rythmus u. altdeutsche Rythmik in lateinischen Versen," *Göttinger Nachrichten*, 1908, pp. 31–81. But clearly as he is able to show the disturbing influence of such ictus on the usually schematic Latin line, helpful as the results of his study may be in strengthening our belief that certain poems are of German workmanship, there is undoubted danger, in the light of our present knowledge, in making the unsupported assertion that every Latin line whose syllables are apparently influenced by such ictus is German in origin.

Meyer himself cites the case of Dhuoda's poems (cf. Bondurant, *Le manuel de Dhuoda* [1887], pp. 47, 225, 228, 240; Traube, *Karolingische Dichtungen* [1888], pp. 141–148). Dhuoda was married in Aachen in the year 824, was duchess of Septimania, and wrote her verses in Uzès near the lower Rhone. Meyer acknowledges that she scarcely can have had anything to do with German verse-makers, but surmises, on the basis of his syllable-test alone, that she may have been the daughter of a Frankish house, and either in her parents' home or in her own have come to know the agreeable, fresh and diversified Franco-German popular rhythms and to use them to enliven the monotonous Latin rhythmical form of her four poems. To the query why Dhuoda did not imitate the native, popular

Gallic rhythms, Meyer answers that the existence of old French and Provençal poems at that time must first be proved.

Except as contributory evidence, to join with other testimony of the paternity of a poem in order to establish its birthplace, I do not think we can yet accept either impure rhyme or syllabic inequality.

5. *Internal testimony (such as treatment of theme, symbolism, manner) may suggest an un-German source for a song.* This I believe to be the worst and the best of all five methods—according as we administer it. At its worst the method is utterly untrustworthy, for it is based upon some preconceived assumption. To give an illustration: There is a widespread belief, which I have already referred to, that German poets during the twelfth century, whether secular or clerical, were less able to write a correct Latin song than their French brethren. It may be true that the French were the authors of all the mediaeval Latin lyrics worth the having; but how shall we prove it? The Archpoet may still be a German, if you wish, and so may an occasional poet in the *Carmina burana*. It is unsafe to decide against an anonymous Latin lyric of springtime and love as a German production, just because one rather gathers without the slightest show of reason that to be German in the twelfth century one must be comparatively stupid.

At its best the fifth method is subjective. It demands that others see the matter as do we, and there is no absolute analytical test that it can employ to educe proof. But, if we are careful, this method leads to suggestive if not final results and joins with other tests to establish as great certainty as we may reach until fuller revelation comes. It is no preconceived assumption that the presence of one kind of style, diction, word-vocabulary, one manner of theme-treatment, one type of figurative imagery, has always been an inalienable part of popular German poetry. If we are right in thinking now and again that we get strong hints of such *volkslied*-symbolism in a Latin lyric, the presumption is that the latter is somehow German in origin. We don't know much about the stupidity of twelfth-century German lyric poets, but we do know something of their manner of writing; for it is on the one hand documented in early *minnesang*, on the other hand we may reason at times from the analogy of later texts. Just as surely do we know something of early French popularizing poetry: the *pastourelle* and the *romance*, for example. These types exhibit in their turn a certain style and diction. We cannot be sure all French poets that wrote Latin were bright, but we may decide that a Latin lyric is French in origin, if it show the verbal figurative atmosphere of a French *chansonnette*.

We need not be surprised to discover that the more mechanical and mathematical methods of studying a Latin lyric which was wafted across Europe for two centuries are not always the safest. Nor may we rightly

scoff at applying in our study the test of style and diction. Let us only mock when the application is not intelligently or honestly made.

"Modern" nature-sense.—It has been often felt that a dividing line may be established between antique and modern treatment of nature in epic and lyric verse. Nature description in the classical poets, particularly the Romans, is sometimes held to be a bye-production, an occasional embellishment, a thing to be done with a few strokes, more indicated than carried out in detail (cf. Baehrens, *Unedirte lateinische Gedichte* [1877], p. 35); whereas modern art has assigned to nature an independent importance, sentimentalizes its every delicate particular, discovers in it a latent sympathy for every possible human emotion.

I doubt if this difference of attitude toward nature should be made a criterion of different ages of poetic art. I believe it rather a distinguishing characteristic of separate kinds of poetry within the same period. One sort of nature treatment is epic (objective), the other lyric (subjective); the first kind views nature from without, the other sees it from within. Any period of poetic art of which we have full record would, I believe, show both attitudes. This statement is important for one reason, if for no other. We speak of the "evolution of nature-sense in poetry," as if it were something that grows from an original grain of mustard until it becomes a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof. Rather, I imagine, does this nature-sense dwell in every age, to come to fuller expression in such times as are most given to the writing of lyrical poetry. Did we not know for example that the following description of nature occurred in the Easter-sequence of Notker, we might well imagine it the work of Adam of St. Victor nearly three hundred years later:

Favent igitur
resurgenti Christo cuncta gaudiis:
Flores, segetes
redivivo fructu vernant,
et volucres
gelu tristi terso dulce jubilant.
Lucent clarius
sol et luna morte Christi turbida;
Tellus herbida
resurgenti plaudit Christo,
quae tremula
ejus morte se casuram minitat.

Cf. Mone, *Lateinische Hymnen*, Vol. I, p. 201, Schubinger, *Die Sängerschule St. Gallens*, p. 48, Winterfeld, *Neue Jahrbücher*, Vol. V, p. 355, Gautier, *Œuvres d'Adam de S. V.*, Vol. I, p. 82:

Mundi renovatio
nova parit gaudia,
Resurgenti domino
conresurgunt omnia.

Similar nature-parallelism of a direct kind was frequent enough in secular poems of St. Gall and Reichenau, if we believe the testimony of the songs of welcome which Walafrid, Ratpert, and Notker addressed to visiting sovereigns, e. g.:

Innovatur nostra laetos
Terra flores proferens;
Ver novum praesentat aestas,
Dum datur te cernere.

Plus hodie solito radiat sol clarus in alto,
Cumque serena venis nubila cuncta teris.
Floribus arva nitent, quia te nos visere cernunt,
Foetibus atque solum germinat omne bonum.

Haec ipsa gaudent tempora,
Floreque verno germinant
Adventus omni gaudio,
Quando venit optatior.

There is nothing in the tone of these nature-pictures to remind one of the ninth or tenth century.

But, no matter! Suppose we feel it incumbent upon us to keep the adjective "modern" when speaking of nature treatment in poetry. Then we must make this word so elastic that it includes the fourth century of our era. For such verses as the *Pervigilium Veneris* or one of the poems ascribed to Tiberianus (not mentioned by Glover, *Life and Letters in the Fourth Century!*) are colored by "modern" sentiment.

Amnis ibat inter arva valle fusus frigida,
Luce ridens calculorum, flore pictus herbido.
Caerulas superne laurus et virecta myrtea
Leniter motabat aura blandiente sibilo;
Subtus autem molle gramen flore adulto creverat:
Tum croco solum rubebat et lucebat liliis
Et nemus fragrabat omne violarum sub spiritu.
Inter ista dona veris gemmeasque gratias
Omnium regina odorum vel colorum Lucifer
Aureo flore eminebat cura Cypridis rosa.
Antra muscus et virentes intus myrtus vinxerant.
Roscidum nemus rigebat inter uda gramina:
Fonte crebro murmurabant hinc et inde rivuli;
Quae fluenta labibunda guttis ibant lucidis.
Has per umbras omnis ales plus canora quam putes
Cantibus vernis strepebat et susurris dulcibus;
Hic loquentis murmur amnis concinebat frondibus,
Quis melos vocalis aurae musa zefyri moverat.
Sic euntem per virecta pulchra odora et musica
Ales amnis aura lucus flos et umbra juverat.

Cf. Baehrens, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

Recovering a song.—To reconstruct the text of a lyric poem on the basis of a single corrupt MS is technically an inadmissible thing. The temptation to do so has, however, assailed most investigators of mediaeval poetry and many have been their lapses from grace. For several years I was sorely tried by No. 89 of the *Carmina burana*. The theme of it was,

it seemed to me, "When the devil was sick, the devil a monk would be," or as the libertine Serlo of Wilton expressed it: "Dum fero languorem, / fero relligionis amorem; / Expers languoris, / non sum memor hujus amoris." Cf. Hauréau, *Notices et extraits de quelques MSS*, Vol. I, p. 314; II, p. 213. We have a prose rendering of the same story in Caesarius of Heisterbach's *Dialogus miraculorum*, cap. XVI (ed. Stange, 1851; cf. also Kaufmann, *Zeitschr. des Vereins für rheinische Geschichte*, Vol. I, 1862). The archpoet Nicolaus, fearing a mortal sickness, joins the Cistercians, but when danger is past he throws off his cowl with a jest and flees; cf. *Leipziger Blätter für Pädagogik*, Vol. VI (1872), p. 41. Our poem contains three eight-versed stanzas, indicating the liveliest sort of dialogue between a stricken son afraid of death and wishing therefore to take vows and a father who urges against such a step. At the end comes swiftly and without warning a quick break of mood worthy of Heine. These three stanzas form a whole that is light, witty, and dramatic, if we change two evident mistakes (*frater* thrice to *pater; floribus* to *fletibus*), and allow the substitution of the feminine gender for the masculine in the last three verses of the second eight-versed stanza). Without this change, the piece was, I thought, to be regarded as either incoherent or sodomitic.

Between the first two eight-versed stanzas, however, come ten quatrains didactic in tendency, retarding the action, broadly animadverting upon the contrasts of heavenly and earthly life. In a word, our poem at once becomes a *debat*, a *conflictus*. The wit of the poem is destroyed and the tone of it spoiled to modern notion by these interpolations. We have dozens of examples in the *Carmina burana* of patched-together songs. It is interesting to know that by treating No. 89 in a way which experience has seemed to justify in other cases, by removing part of it that ill agrees with the rest, by restoring a reading that may have been altered to suit the needs of a patchwork song, we have a lyric left us which is so unique an instance of clever humor as to stand strikingly forth. What perhaps took place was that a monk or clerk attracted by the dramatic quality of the piece, and its treatment of a theme which appealed to mediaeval taste—the antithesis of carnal and ascetic pursuits—turned a lyric into a *conflictus*. One of the most popular school-books in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries was the *Ecloga* of Theodulus, as Mr. Hamilton reminds me. It inspired many a *schularbeit*—it may have spoiled many a lyric (cf. Selbach, *Das Streitgedicht in der altprovenz. Dichtung* [1886]).

"Son: Father, quick with help and counsel, I'm dying and would be a monk. Father: A plague upon logic! It drives clerks to exile and wretchedness. But then you'll no more see him [her] you love, the poor pretty N. the clerk (the mistress). Son: Alack! Whatever to do I know not, I drift in the desert without help. Dry your tears, father, perhaps I am getting better—I've changed my mind anyhow and shall be no monk."

If such twisting of a song be considered idle trifling, let us remember the happy chance that led to Wilhelm Meyer's restoration of two songs out of two fragments, with some trimming of the crust that overlapped the edges of the pastry-tin! (Nos. 81 and 169). Two stanzas of No. 108 are a gloss made by boiling down Juventinus. A similar *denkvers* ruins No. 33. No. 174 is rebuilt of bricks from a demolished No. 36, and No. 176 owes most to No. 37, a little to Nos. 179 and CLXXXVI, and the rest doubtless to an as yet undiscovered source. So runs on the tale. And while I should by no means urge my restoration of No. 89, I cannot yet quite discredit it. Others presumably can—and will.

Peiper long ago called attention to the similarity between the verses in this song

> O ars dialectica
> Numquam esses cognita,
> Quae tot facis clericos
> Exules ac miseros,

and lines in the *Amphitryon* of Vitalis; cf. the editions of Osann (1836), Müller (1840); *Bibl. de l'Ecole des chartes*, 2e ser., Vol. IV, p. 486, and especially Cloetta, *Beitr. z. Littgesch. d. Mittelalters*, Vol. I, pp. 68 ff., 152 f. "What reader of Freytag's *Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit*," askes Peiper, "does not at such a time think of the Gothic king Theodahad whose weak brain had been confused by Roman rhetors?" Cf. Müllenbach, *Comoediae elegiacae* (1885) and Peiper, "Die profane Komödie des Mittelalters," *Archiv für Litteraturgeschichte*, Vol. V (1876), p. 518.

Popularity of nugae amatoriae.—We should not be too ready to believe that Peter of Blois's lighter songs possessed a popularity beyond the power of flood, fire, or ruin to destroy (*supra*, p. 65); that Abelard wrote lyrics which were on everybody's lips (p. 23); that Walter's poems resounded through all France (pp. 23, 67); that people generally knew of the mocking satires of young Bernard, etc. That sort of statement must be taken with as many grains of salt as must mediaeval ascriptions of poetry to a distant, unknown, or fictitious author. It was a common exaggeration in the Middle Ages to assume more or less world-wide popularity for mediocre performances. Thus in a letter of the late eleventh century (Ivonis, Carnutensis episcopi, epistolae lxvi, lxvii) we hear the following about a poor bishop of Orleans: "Quidam enim concubii sui appellantes eum *Floram* multas rithmicas cantilenas de eo composuerunt, sicut nostis miseriam terrae illius, *per urbes Franciae* in plateis et compitis cantitantur." Thus again Wolter in his Chronica bremensis speaks of a certain Otbert who early in the thirteenth century was known *everywhere* for his pretended miracles ("et fama ejus *in omni terra* personuit"): "carmina elogica fuerunt de eo facta et cantata in viis." Cf. Du Méril

(1847), p. 5, n. 2; p. 193, n. 6. Examples of such hyperbole might be readily multiplied.

Lighter songs that were popular were ascribed to the famous churchmen and schoolmen of the Middle Ages, and conversely the songs ascribed to them were thought of as popular. Walter's boast of the vogue of his musical songs did not seem strange to that posterity which overvalued his *Alexandreis*. This bulky poem was one of the oftenest read school-texts until the sixteenth century; it was considered by many superior to the work of Vergil and Ovid; its maxims were quoted by writers of the Middle Ages along with the epigrams of classical authors (Giesebrecht, *Allg. Monatsschr.*, 1853, 369). It is easy to understand how students came to grant ready credence to overstatements regarding the wide dissemination of the school-lyrics of Walter and others.

Lyrics of reflection.—A dozen times I was near changing my discussion of the didactic lyric (pp. 32 f.), to include under a separate rubric *lyrics of reflection*. Moralizing poems are as a general rule without the pale of lyric expression, but if they happen to achieve individuality like Serlo's *Ego quondam filius* (*Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. V, p. 297; Werner, *Beiträge*, p. 147), if they are clothed in musical stanzas, if they gain and hold our sympathy, it is difficult to dismiss them unmentioned. Gröber (*Grundriss*, Vol. II, pp. 379–80) sufficiently indicates the type I mean, but when we study such a group of songs as he lists we discover that though they are at times briefer and simpler in cadence and rhyme than most *lehrgedichte*, the difference is apt to be but one of degree and not of kind. It was this sort of *planctus* that monks and clerks embellished and overloaded until the original appeal was lost in the euphuistic mazes of swollen diction. To choose but one example, and that of a high order of merit: the *Cygnus exspirans* (Daniel, *Thesaurus hymnologicus*, Vol. IV, p. 351) is a poem of some direct effectiveness. It opens with a stanza that promises the best:

> Parendum est, cedendum est,
> Claudenda vitae scena;
> Est jacta sors, me vocat mors,
> Haec hora est postrema:
> Valete res, valete spes;
> Sic finit cantilena.

But scarce are we launched in the *planctus* which consists of 72 lines when acervation commences and simplicity ends. Judged by this standard several songs of the *Carmina burana* are of much lyric worth. These are not the famous *Versa est in luctum cythara Waltheri* (LXXXVI) although the refrains indicate it was meant to be sung, nor *Licet aeger cum aegrotis* (LXXI; cf. Wright, *Political Songs*, p. 44; Kingsford, *English Historical Review* [1890], p. 325; Dreves, *Analecta hymnica*, Vol. XXI, p. 145), nor *Ecce torpet probitas* (LXVII; with two refrains; cf. *Anzeiger f. Kunde d. d. Vorzeit*, Vol. VII, col. 294; Schreiber,

Vagantenstrophe, p. 168), nor yet any of the *planctus* in either Christmas play or Passion play (CCII, CCIII). Even No. VI, graceful as it is in manner, is hardly a song in point because of its grimness of conception and the generality of its phrasing. But Nos. X (*Dum juventus floruit*) and LXIX (*Florebat olim studium* are musical, not over-earnest, individual in note, and sing themselves. The first runs:

Dum juventus floruit,
Licuit
Et libuit
Facere quod placuit,
Juxta voluntatem
Currere,
Peragere,
Carnis voluptatem;

and the second is no less happy. The theme of its forty-eight verses is that the clerks are to blame for the decay of learning which in common with all things good is gone quite to the dogs. Scholastic allusion abounds; we hear of Brunel's ass (Nigel Wireker, *Speculum stultorum*), of Gregory, Jerome, the bishop Wikterp of Regensburg, Augustine, Benedict, Mary, Martha, Leah, Rachel, Caro, and Lucrece, but even this ill custom can not stale its infinite variety.

Had there been in all the range of mediaeval Latin lyrics further songs like these, they would have had separate place in the body of the study. But each in its own way these pieces are conspicuous for their isolation in the species to which they belong.

Frauenstrophen.—Curious, it seems to me, is the contention of Wilmanns (*Walther von der Vogelweide*, 1882, p. 165) that if the women-stanzas (cf. *supra*, p. 109) presuppose earlier lyric models than those of *minnesang* these must be songs of professional female minstrels such as can be shown to have existed in Romance countries at this time. "The position in life occupied by these girls permitted them to give frank utterance in song to devoted love and ardent longing, from which a natural reserve and feminine modesty withheld other women. During his Italian journey bishop Wolfger of Passau had opportunity to get such *puellae cantantes* to sing to him."

Even were it necessary to believe women composed the *frauenstrophen*, we should scarcely seek their origin in the performances of *miminnen*, *jongleuresses*, and *spielmänninnen*, for there is nothing in the presumptive work and calling of such creatures, in so far as we learn of them, that would inspire the tender lines under discussion.

Stimmungsbrechung.—To the examples of sudden break of mood instanced above (pp. 8, 91) add

Ecce laetantur omnia,
Quaeque dant sua gaudia, —
Excepto me qui gratia
Amicae meae careo.

(Du Méril [1847], p. 234, from a xiii-century French MS). The same song contains a much simpler *minnegruss* than *Carmina burana* no. 82 (cf. *supra* p. 14):

Quot sunt arenae littore,
Quot folia in arbore,
Quot rami sunt in nemore,
Tot dolores sustineo;
Ob hoc infirmus corpore,
Quod hanc tenere nequeo.

Rursus quot sunt in aethere
Astra, vel quot sub aere
Homines credo vivere,
Tot vicibus congaudeo
Cum possum mane tangere
Quam semper mente video.

Literati and laici.—Add to the four quotations under this heading (cf. *supra*, p. 123, note 2):

Nuper ego didici, quod semper sunt inimici
Clerici et laici, solet hoc per saecula dici.

Cf. *Romanische Forschungen*, Vol. III, p. 285. Schmeller in a note to the *Mass of Gamesters* (*Carmina burana*, p. 249) remarks that the following is written on the margin of the MS in a later hand than that of the original scribe: Omnipotens sempiterne deus, qui inter rusticos et clericos magnam discordiam seminasti, praesta quaesumus de laboribus eorum vivere, de mulieribus ipsorum vero et de morte Deciorum semper gaudere. In a mock-mass of a later time still Werner (*Beiträge*, p. 212) discovers a similar passage:

Audi nos. Nam rustici, qui sunt semper contra nos.
Da eis aquam bibere,
Da nobis vinum bonum consúmere.
Vers.: Rustici sunt laeti
Quando sunt repleti
Resp.: Et sunt inflati
Quando sunt inebriati.
Deus, qui multitudinem rusticorum congregasti
Et magnam discordiam inter eos et nos seminasti,
Da, quaesumus, ut laboribus eorum fruamur
Et ab uxoribus eorum diligamur,
Per omnia pocula poculorum. Amen.

In the *Ass's Testament* (cf. *supra*, p. 134) the shoe seems to be on the other foot, for the dying animal of the rustic finds strength to make his will as follows:

Vocem dat cantoribus,
Collum potatoribus,
Virgam dat scholaribus.

Rhymed letters and laudatory odes.—Lack of space forbade quoting sufficient examples of the gallant and amorous versification (cf. *supra*, pp. 72–76) in vogue at the French schools in the twelfth century, to show how stilted and conventionalized it was. He who would learn at a glance the manner of such stereotyped utterance may conveniently do

so by running over several numbers of MS C. 58/275 in the City Library of Zurich (Werner, *Beiträge zur Kunde der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters* [1905]: 48, 49, 66, 116–121) and contrasting them with popularizing *billets doux* such as no. 141 of the *Carmina burana*, which begins:

O mi dilectissima,
Vultu serenissima
Et mente lege sedula
Ut mea refert littera.
Manda liet! manda liet!
Min geselle chumet niet.

The Zurich MS was quite certainly the work of a German clerk who studied at French schools like Orleans and Paris and brought home to Germany with him this notebook, the fruit of his labors. It contains something of every type of poetry current in his day and gives an adequate idea of what was going forward at the time. A short consideration of the material in this book will convince any doubter that neither the goliard lyric or the popular lyric grew on any such trunk. There are but a handful of pieces among the four hundred which comprise the MS that have either life or the popular breath in them: e. g., nos. 15 of the Jew that fell into the privy; 90 Snow-child; 149 Spring-song; 197 Marbod's description of the beauty of spring; 342, 343 Two famous parting songs of the clerk off for school; 365 Confession of Golias; 386 Serlo's apostrophe to a misspent life—not a dozen numbers in all.

German fabliaux.—Although Bédier defines fabliaux as *contes à rire en vers* (*Les fabliaux*, 1895², pp. 28 ff.) he dates the first one 1159 (cf. his monograph on the 'fabliau de Richeut' in *Études dédiées à M. G. Paris*, 1891). Neglecting the German fabliaux of a much earlier time which are contained in the Cambridge MS, Bédier is thus able to establish his contes as distinctively French types, exemplars of the 'esprit gaulois,' etc. Ker (*Dark Ages*, p. 227) with a clearer because more unprejudiced vision writes as follows: "The comic literature of Germany has never had much credit from other nations, though they have been ready to live on it without acknowledgment, borrowing Till Owlglass and other jesters. In the Middle Ages Germany is ahead of France in a kind which is reckoned peculiarly French; the earliest fabliaux are in German Latin, with Swabians for comic heroes—the story of the *Snow-Child*, and the other *How the Swabian Made the King say 'That's a story.'* The former one with considerable elegance in phrasing tells a story fit for the *Decameron;* the other with less ambition gives one of the well-known popular tales—a monstrous lie rewarded with the hand of the king's daughter. The malice of the *Snow-Child* is something different from anything in vernacular literature till the time of Boccaccio and Chaucer; the learned language and the rather difficult verse perhaps helping to refine the mischief of the story. It is self-conscious, amused at its own craft: a different thing from the ingenuous simplicity of the French

"merry tales," not to speak of the churlish heaviness of the worst among them." Ker could have added to his enumeration of early German fabliaux the tales of Heriger and Alfrad, at least, without exceeding Bédier's definition, even if it should be felt that *Unibos* (Gevatter Einochs), and certain shorter animal tales like *Priester und Wolf* or *Hahn und Fuchs* scarcely came within the category.

Other *lügenmärchen* that have come down to us in the early poetry of the cloister are the *Three Brothers and the Goat* and *Notker's Mushroom* (cf. *Poetae aevi Karolini*, Vols. II, p. 474, IV, p. 336; *Neue Jahrbücher*, Vol. V, pp. 347 ff., Winterfeld, *Stilfragen*, pp. 15 ff.), one written by Notker, it may be, the other by Ekkehard IV. When we recall the droll tales mentioned above, when we remember the precious humor and satire which breathes at times in the *Gesta Karoli* (Eishere, the Goblin and the Farrier, the Bishop and the Jew) and the *Casus Sancti Galli* (Heribald and the Hungarians, the Scourging of Sindolf, Hadwig at the Hohentwiel), when we view Wichart's son's satire *De amicitia et conubio* (Keinz, *Zeitschr. f. deut. Phil.*, Vol. IV, p. 145), Walafrid's reply to Probus, Ermenrich's yarn about Homer, Orcus and the Louse, Liutprand's story of the pranks of Emperor Leo, or Rather's fable of the Frog and the Mouse—it is difficult for us to credit the statement that the first *conte à rire en vers* was French and of the year 1159.

Tenth-century culture.—In an earlier essay (*Modern Philology*, Vol. III, p. 424) two records of the tenth century are used to bring into sharp contrast the dulness and the brilliance of imagination which characterized that time, and to prove that offhand summing-up of this period as one of gloom is unadvisable. Bartoli, for example, to quote but one incisive critic among many, says: "Il medio evo non pensa: esso non ha che un sentimento solo predominante, quello dell' oltremondano, che lo preoccupa, lo absorbe, lo atterrisce e lo inebria" (*I precursori del rinascimento*, p. 19). Better far than Bartoli's one-sided assertion is Ker's setting-off of Gerbert of Rheims and Rodulph Glaber against each other: "Gerbert is followed in literary history by Rodulphus, like a hero with a comic squire: Rodulphus represents the permanent underlayer of mediaeval absurdity above which Gerbert rises so eminently; the two together make it impossible to arrive at any easy generalization about the culture of the Dark Ages. Gerber's letters are those of a man for whom there were other interests besides rhetoric and philosophy, they admit one to a close acquaintance with the very life of that obscure time, and a knowledge of actual motives and character. Some of his short notes have the same kind of reality as Cicero's, being not records or reflections but practical agents in a great revolution. Rodulphus' book is one of the most authentic renderings anywhere to be found of the average mind of the time—both in the contents of the mind, visions, portents, stories, and in its artless,

movement from any point to any circumference. He has sometimes been treated too heavily, as if the whole Middle Age were summed up in Rodulphus Glaber. That is not so." (*Dark Ages*, pp. 198 f.)

In other words, the tenth century like any other was a time of many possibilities. So far as the lyric is concerned, monks were apt to write monkish odes, minstrels were quite as sure to compose musical songs. There is no lyric poem out of earlier cloister-life warmer than Walafrid's *Elegy to Home* (*Poetae aevi Karolini*, Vol. II, p. 412), but the Cambridge MS alone is sufficient to show what the minstrels were doing. We should not interpret the culture of the tenth century in terms of either type by itself.

Profane lyrics in Latin plays:—Taylor has shown (*Modern Philology*, Vols. IV, pp. 605 ff., V, pp. 1 ff.) the influence of Middle English religious lyrics on the development of the drama; cf. also Thien, *Über die englischen Marienklagen* (1906). Wechssler performed a like service for the Romance planctus (1893) and Schönbach for the German (1874). Bibliography in Taylor, p. 606, note 1, and Chambers, *Medieval Stage*, Vol. II, p. 39. The former promises soon a paper on the influence of the satire of the day upon Corpus Christi plays; it is to be hoped he will extend his work to include the didactic lyric and the lyric of reflection. But no one has as yet undertaken to examine all the evidence that exists to show how dependent the mediaeval church- and school-plays were upon the profane, erotic lyrics of their time.

Santangelo (*Studio sulla poesia goliardica*, pp. 46 f.) made a beginning by grouping together the Latin lyrics which occur in Christmas and Easter plays in three instances (*Carmina burana*, nos. 202, 203; Du Méril [1847], p. 213). One can scarcely blame Gerhoh of Reichersberg and Herrad of Landsberg for their censure of ecclesiastical plays, if many of them contained such verses as those employed in the Benedictbeuern Easter play (*Carmina burana*, pp. 92, 149, 275; a completer version in Hauréau, *Not. et Extr.*, Vol. XXIX, ii, p. 314); of which it will suffice to give the last two stanzas:

Respondenti metus
Trahit hanc ad fletus
Sed natura laetus
Amor indiscretus
Queam
Lineam
Jam pudoris tangere,
Meam
In eam
Manum mittit propere.
Dum propero,
Vim infero,
Post imminente machina.
Nec supero,
Nam aspero
Defendens ungue limina
Obserat introitus.

Tantalus admotum
Non amitto potum;
Sed ne meum totum
Frustret illa votum,
Suo
Denuo
Collo jungens brachium
Ruo,
Diruo
Tricaturam crurium.
Ut virginem
Devirginem,
Me totum toti insero,
Ut cardinem
Determinem,
Duellum istud resero.
Gloriar victoria.

It is difficult to determine in the light of such evidence whether songs like these were inserted in dramas for the purpose of lending the required tone of wordliness, the desirable contrast to the godly conversation elsewhere employed, or whether the opportunity was taken to introduce scabrous material for its own sake.

The Meaning of "goliard."—Schönbach complains that council-decrees and synod-statutes which deal with the attitude of the church toward the popular festivals and entertainments have not been investigated with sufficient care and accuracy. He demands that Spanish enactments of the seventh century which have been handed down in transumpts be not utilized in determining the state of German culture during the twelfth century (*Die Anfänge des Minnesangs*, p. 3). Now the first decree regarding goliards is the order of Gautier of Sens (d. 913), the last is the *concilium Frisingense* (1440), more than 500 years apart. These statutes are given in Germany, France, and England; some of them speak of the goliard specifically as of a certain class of person, some of them—particularly the later ones—treat him as any sort of entertainer. It is equally dangerous to generalize from one of these decretals or to particularize from them all together. Santangelo (*op. cit.*, p. 14) asserts: "I goliardi furono giullari e non scolari vaganti: proverò che non furon nemmeno poeti, cioè gli autori della poesia goliardica." This statement is doubtless true of some goliards in some country at some time between the Dark Ages and the Renaissance—Chaucer's *goliardeys* for example was a miller and no clerk. But as a general contention Santangelo's remark is uncritical, for in many of our references to goliards we have but examples of the heaping-up of words so dear to the mediaeval mind. Cf., for instance, the meaningless lists of names included under "familia Herlekini" (Driesen, *Der Ursprung des Herlekin* [1904], pp. 33 ff.)

Der Marner (*floruit ca.* 1230) was a clerk who wrote Latin songs, five of which have descended to us (cf. Strauch, *Quellen und Forschungen*, Vol. XIV [1876], pp. 94, 129; *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vols. XXII [1876], p. 254, XXIV [1878], p. 90; Meyer, *Fragmenta burana.* But Marner was at the same time a common player and minstrel and has informed us somewhat scornfully what a varied stock of goods the *spielmann* had to have within his roll (cf. Strauch, XV, 14 and 16, pp. 124, 127). Some of his wares were the old heroic tales and myths, some the courtly *minnesang.* In the former content mattered, not the shape of the recital (*der wigt min wort ringer danne ein ort;* "*my* words they hold not worth a doit"), in the latter it was the poetic setting that the audience cared for. And Marner was ready with every sort from the simplest German saw to the polished Latin ode on the Abbot of Maria-Saal or the *Jam pridum aestivalia* (*Carm. bur.*, No. 95; Zingerle, *Wiener Sitzungsber.*, Vol.

LIV [1866], p. 319). Konrad Marner therefore furnishes an interesting phase of the goliard situation in the thirteenth century, but it it is not safe to generalize too much from this single instance.

Golias⟨gula.—Thomas Wright in proposing the etymology Golias from *gula*, "gullet, throat, palate" (*Latin Poems* [1841], p. x) was but following the authority of writers from twelfth century to fourteenth. Gerald of Barri's well-known description of Golias in the *Speculum ecclesiae*. "Item, parasitus quidam Golias nomine nostris diebus gulositate pariter et leccacitate famosissimus" contains a play upon words still popular in Piers Plowman: "a goliardeis, a gloton of wordes." But this derivation springs like many other similar ones from the inexplicable English delight in punning, or at least from the distressing habit of paronomasia so common to mediaeval scholasticism. An etymology thus born should be viewed askance as the following passage proves. I quote fully for two reasons, first, because of the evident appositeness to our theme; second, because I do not think the passage is well-known. I found it in *Anecdota Oxoniensia* (Classical Series), Vol. I, Part V, p. 62: *Glossae in Sidonium* (twelfth century):

> Leccatorum multa genera. Quidam enim dicuntur mimi, quidam balatrones, quidam nebulones, quidam nepotes, quidam scurrae, quidam lenones, quidam histriones, quidam parasiti, quidam farmacopolae, a farmaca quod est unguentum et pole quod est vendere. De mimis dicit Horatius in Sermonibus Ambubaiarum collegia farmacopolae Mendici mimi balatrones hoc penus omne Maestum ac sollicitum est mei pro morte Tigelli. Et notandum quod balatrones dicuntur a baratro quod est infernus. Dicitur autem baratrum quasi voratrum quia omnia devorat. Inde balatrones quasi voratores, quia propria devorant et aliena consumunt. Dicuntur nebulones a nebula quia ad modum nebulae transit gloria eorum. Vel quia aliena vitia per suas adulationes obcaecant. Dicuntur nepotes a nepa serpente quae suos fetus devorat. Scurra proprie appellatur vagus qui de domo ad domum discurrit ut ventrem satiet. De quibus bene dicitur, Quorum deus venter est. Unde Magister Serlo Scurrae jejuni te contra guttura muni. Lenones dicuntur conciliatores stupri. Unde quidam egregius versificator Leno ferre pedem talem non debet in aedem. Hac habitare domo debet honestus homo. Histrio dicitur ab historon quod est adulari. Unde quidam in cantilena sua Meretur histrio virtutis praemium, Dum palpat vitium dulci mendacio. Parasiti dicuntur quasi parantes situs hominum vel quasi juxta parapsidem siti.

Archipoeta and Walther von der Vogelweide.—More than thirty years ago Martin remarked certain correspondences between Walther's verse and goliardic poetry (*Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XX, p. 66): "Doch es liesse sich auch sonst wol so manches in Walthers gedanken und ausdrücken mit der lateinischen vagantenpoesie vergleichen: nicht nur als *minnedichter* deren scholastik ja auch bei den andern mhd. lyrikern nachwürkt, sondern auch als mahner zum kreuzzug und gegner der römischen curie waren ihm die fahrenden kleriker vorausgegangen." The same statement recurs in Burdach's *Walther von der Vogelweide* (1900), pp. 37, 42, 184 f., although it has never been subjected to a thoroughgoing analysis: "Nach dem Vorbild der lateinisch dichten-

den Vaganten gestaltet Walther die deutsche volksmässige gnomische Dichtung der Spielleute in seiner Weise um. Er wird ein Nachfolger der Spervogelschen Schule und zugleich des Archipoeta. Das muss auch auf seine *Liebespoesie* entscheidend einwirken, sie von Grund aus umgestalten." "Er ist der erste ritterliche Sänger, der halb und halb das Leben und die Kunst der Fahrenden, der Vaganten sich aneignet. Er muss wie seine Vorläufer, der Spervogelsche Kreis und die Goliarden, nach der Gunst der Herren streben." "Die lateinische Vagantendichtung lebt in diesen Vorstellungen. Der Archipoeta verherrlichte in überschwänglicher Weise das staufische Imperium . . . . Ihm erscheint Friedrich Barbarossa als neuer Karl der Grosse . . . . Walther, auf den die Vagantenlieder vielfach eingewirkt haben, mag wohl auch von diesen Stimmen enthusiastischer Kaiserverherrlichung gerührt worden sein."

Now if these things are true, and there is at present no good reason to doubt them, it should be the duty of someone carefully to gather and sift the philological evidence, that it can be adduced as proof. Until this is done we cannot know how direct the influence which mediaeval Latin poetry exercised on Walther's political and love lyrics. For of course another possibility always exists, viz., that both Latin and German poems were modeled after a Provençal (French) original.

Recently (*Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XLVII [1904], p. 319) Martin has cited various themes and phrases of Walther's which are analogous to passages in Andreas Capellanus' *De Amore* (ed. Trojel, 1892) a book written in the last decade or two of the twelfth century (cf. Grimm, *Kleinere Schriften*, Vol. III, p. 44). But how far Martin is justified in terming Andreas' work "a Latin *source* of German minnesang"—that still remains to be seen.

Early minstrelsy.—I hesitated to include in my list of early Latin minstrelsy (Part I, pp. 44 ff.) the verses which Heyne recovers (from *Opera Gregorii Turonensis*, edd. Arndt et Krusch, Vol. II, p. 651) regarding the *spielmann* of King Miro. Cf. Heyne, *Altdeutsch-lateinische Spielmannsgedichte des X. Jahrhunderts* (1900), p. xxiv. They are supposedly of the year 589:

Heu, miserō succurite
Oppresso mi subvenite,
Adpenso relevamini
Et pro me sancti Martini
Virtutem deprecamini,
Qui tali plaga adfligor,
Tali exitu crucior,
Incisione disjungor.

The minstrel (Reich, *Der Mimus*, Vol. I, p. 826, calls him *hofnarr*) disobedient to the command of his lord Miro tries to pick a bunch of ripe grapes in the arbor before the portal of St. Martin's Church. His hand is caught as in a vise and his arm begins to wither. At first the *spiel-*

mann laughs and pretends it is all one of his trade tricks, but the pain soon overcomes him and he cries out in anguish: "succurite, viri, misero, subvenite oppresso, relevamini, adpenso et sancti antistitis Martini virtutem pro me deprecamini, qui tali exitu crucior, tali plaga adfligor, tali incisione disjungor."

Sequence and Leich.—In connection with the claim that profane song was born of the sequence (Part I, p. 6) it is interesting to recall that Lachmann wrote im 1829: "When I can produce Latin poems which two hundred years before the *leiche* have just the *leich*-form, dactyls and all but without rhyme; when these poems although in part secular are descended from church-music and from a very similar form that is still about a century older; then I dare say no one will hesitate to derive the *leiche*, and with them the dactylic rhythms, from ecclesiastical poetry" (*Kleinere Schriften*, Vol. I, p. 334). Later Lachmann prints the Cambridge poem on the snow-child and the *modus Ottinc*, remarking (p. 339): "These poems are themselves apparently only a development of the sacred type whose inventor was Notker Balbulus."

Bibliographical notes.—The "literature" devoted to many of the topics discussed in the foregoing study is extensive. It seemed unnecessary, at times impossible, to present all of it or even much of it in footnotes without overburdening my pages beyond endurance. My annotation therefore contents itself with being suggestive and nowhere attempts to be completing. In a few instances I have cited the title of a book which I have not personally studied, but on the other hand have refrained from mentioning much that did not seem essential. I have assumed that there is small need of listing recondite sources of information when convenient bibliographies are easy of access, when such collections as Chevalier's *Répertoire des sources historiques du mogen âge* (Vol. I^2 [1905]; Vol. II [1886]), and Hauréau's *Notices et extraits de quelques manuscrits latins* (6 vols., 1890–93) are at the command of every student of mediaeval philology. This hesitation has left certain longer notes in doubtful shape. Perhaps I would better have added to my references on the snow-child (p. 7, n. 1) Liebrecht, *Zur Volkskunde* (1879), pp. 101 f.; and (as Hamilton suggests) Dunlop-Liebrecht, *Geschichte der Prosadichtungen*, pp. 41, 499, 522, 542; R. Köhler, *Kleinere Schriften*, Vol. III (1900), p. 564. I omitted these titles as they offered no new verse-version of the theme treated. Or again in dealing with the Golias tradition I might have left out certain references, if I did not care to enlarge upon the matter and include others such as Hauréau, Vol. I, p. 387; III, 197; IV, 233, 282–86, 330; VI, 215; *Not. et Extr.*, Vol. XXXII, part 1; Martin, *Observations sur le roman de Renart*, pp. 15, 51. The name of Santangelo in this note, for instance (p. 24), reminds me that I did not list the interesting reflections of other Italian writers such as

Gabrielli, Corradino, Straccali, Ronca, Novati, etc. It seemed, however, that this would be merely to speak by the card and therefore ill-advised.

Page 13, 26.—For Grosseteste substitute William of Wadington; cf. Robert of Brunne's *Handling Synne*, ed. Furnivall (1903), vv. 9045 ff. On the *danseurs maudits* cf. Paris, *Journal des savants* (1899), pp. 733 ff.

Page 15, note 1.—Hertz's notes are abundantly added to by Schönbach in his *Studien zur geschichte der altdeutschen Predigt*, Part II (1900), pp. 56–89 (=*Sitzungsber. d. Wiener Akad.*, Vol. CXLII, 7th essay).

Page 19, 32.—Rand thinks the *delusor* possibly suggested by Terence's own retorts to his critic Lanuvinus. "Mediaeval scholia on Terence may help out on this point—there are suggestive remarks in those published by Schlee, but nothing definite enough to cite." The form of the poem reminds of the *Ecloga Theoduli*. On the study of Terence in the Middle Ages cf. Magnin, *Bibl. de l'École des chartes*, Vol. I, p. 524; Riese, *Zeitschr. f. d. österr. Gymnasien* (1867), p. 442; Köpke, *Hrotsvit v. Gandersheim* (1869), pp. 152, 159, 183; Creizenach, *Gesch. d. neueren Dramas*, Vol. I (1893), p. 17; Cloetta, *Beitr. z. Littgesch. d. Mittelalters*, Vol. I (1890), pp. 2, 4; Gabotto, *Appunti sulla fortuna di alcuni autori romani nel medio evo* (1891), cap. 6 "Terenzio;" Abel, *Die Terenzbiographien des Altertums u. des Mittelalters* (1887); Dziatzko, *Neue Jahrb. f. Phil.* (1894), p. 465; Manitius, *Philologus* (1894), p. 546; Sabbadini, *Studi ital. di filol. class.* (1897), p. 314; Francke, *Terenz u. d. latein. Schulkomödie* (1877); Herrmann, *Mitteil. d. Ges. f. deut. Erzieh.- u. Schulgeschichte* (1893), p. 1; Galzigna, *Fino a che punto i commediografi del rinascimento abbiano imitato Plauto e Terenzio*, Pt. 1 (1899); Santoro, *La Taide in Terenzio e in Dante* (1902). Several of these titles I owe to my colleague, Mr. Beeson.

Page 27, note 3.—The monk of Froidmont is now generally believed to be Helinant; cf. *Les vers de la mort*, edd. Wulff et Walberg (*Société des anciens textes français*, 1905), p. vi. The sermon from which the quotation is made was probably preached in 1229 (cf. *ibid.*, p. xxvi).

Page 35, 5.—For example, the *Quondam fuit factus festus* and the *Sermo noster audiatis* (cf. Wilh. Meyer, *Göttinger Nachrichten*, 1908, pp. 406 ff.). The first of these has exactly the same stanza-form as the "Ave," the identical continuous rhyme of the seven-syllabled lines in *ia*, the second one is evidently a close formal copy of the the first. Both the poems depict the lowest scenes of monastic life in the vulgarest diction. Interesting, but unanswerable, is Meyer's question, if the *Quondam fuit* did not suggest to the authors of the *Epistolae obscurorum virorum* the stylistic device of mocking the old-fashioned university people by having them write ungainly Latin.

Page 38, 22.—Cf. Tobler, *Zeitschr. f. roman. Phil.*, Vol. IX, pp. 288 ff.; Comparetti, *Virgilio nel medio evo* (1896)², Vol. II, pp. 112 ff. (Engl. transl. [1895], pp. 325 ff.); Novati, *Carmina medii aevi* (1883), pp. 15 ff., *Attraverso il medio evo* (1905), pp. 51 ff., 95 ff.; Valmaggi, *Lo spirito antifemminile nel medio evo* (1890); Pascal, "*Antifemminismo medievale*," *Poesia latina medievale* (1907), pp. 151–84. All necessary references and bibliography are given in one or another of these studies.

Page 41, note 1.—For "we know" in l. 2 substitute "Hauréau believes;" and after "Roger" in l. 8 read "who does not share Hauréau's enthusiasm."

Page 42, 23.—For the best recent discussion of *De cuculo* cf. Pascal, *op. cit.*, pp. 123 ff.

Page 53, note 1.—I should perhaps have added to the note regarding May-fête origins reference to the discussion and bibliography contained in Jeanroy's article on "Les chansons" (in Petit de Julleville, *Histoire de la langue et de la littérature française*, Vol. I [1896], pp. 362 ff., 403 f.).

Page 61, notes 1 and 2.—I might have omitted these notes if I had had access to Ronca's study "La prima poesia d' amore in Italia dopo il mille," *Fanfulla della domenica*, Vol. XIII, No. 6.

Page 82, note 2.—Wilh. Meyer would doubt the statement that minstrels wrote well in Romance long before the middle of the ninth century. He says (*Göttinger Nachrichten*, 1908, p. 40): "The most distinguished poets were the writers of Latin quantitative hexameters, inferior to them were the authors of Latin rhythms. But those who attempted to make verses in the different national languages or in one of the many dialects were least esteemed. In France and in the Romance countries Latin was understood by even the least cultured. Therefore a need or a desire for texts in the vulgar tongue did not arise in France till much later [than in the eighth century]. The oldest poems in French that we possess originated in a period when Latin rhythmic poets already observed carefully the scheduled number of syllables, when sequences were already composed in which the same number of syllables was maintained: Phtongis paribus metricata phalanx reboet ac librata (*von der Gegenstrophe*, Dreves, *Analecta hymnica*, Vol. X, p. 150). Naturally then even the oldest French rhythmic poets enumerate their syllables carefully."

Page 85, note 1.—Add the title "Das erste Gedicht der Carmina Burana" (*Göttinger Nachrichten*, 1908, pp. 189 ff.), in which Wilh. Meyer shows no. 66 to be the merest fragment of the poem *Manus ferens munera* (cf. Wright, *Walter Mapes*, p. 226).

Page 87, note 6.—Add Bartsch, *Grundriss zur Geschichte der provenzalischen Literatur* (1872), p. 26; Ronca, *Cultura medievale*, p. 152.

Page 105, note 2.—For further reference to popular tales and songs in mediaeval French sermons cf. Bourgain, *La chaire française au xii. siècle* (1879), pp. 227 ff., La Marche, *La chaire française au moyen âge* (1886)², pp. 284 ff.

Errata.—It seems unnecessary to list all the minor slips in spelling and type contained in the preceding parts of this study: they are evident to any careful reader. Thus, "Robinson" [p. 26, n. 1] should be "Robertson;" "Stephan" [p. 23] is "Stephen;" "a" [p. 40, l. 13] should be "as," etc. But I do not wish to be thought deliberately guilty of the plural form "conflicti" [p. 28] and certain other instances of questionable Latin which were allowed to escape revision because of a confusion in the proof-sheets.

PHILIP SCHUYLER ALLEN

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Modern Philology

VOL. VI *April, 1909* No. 4

BIOLOGICAL ANALOGY IN LITERARY CRITICISM

I

VARIATION AND PERSONALITY

During the last decade the theory of evolution has been undergoing reconstruction. The speculative philosophy of Herbert Spencer is being gradually transformed into a science of genetics. In the biological realm, the observations of Bateson and De Vries on sudden changes in plant forms have thrown new light on the whole question of variation and have resulted in the theory of mutations, while the rediscovery of Mendel's law governing the appearance of definite characters in the cross-breeding of plants and animals has placed in the hands of investigators a formula which may ultimately furnish a clue to explain the origin of species itself.[1]

In the mental world the genetic idea is proving no less productive. Late writers on psychology and sociology have seen that active life must be interpreted as a continuous adjustment or accommodation to the environments of nature, physical, social, cognitive, moral, and aesthetic. The general notion of genesis combined with a functional view of consciousness are gradually obliterating the boundary lines that divided the compartments in the older theories of knowledge. A stricter scientific method with its new terminology seeks to lay emphasis on those modes and processes in consciousness which mark the turning-points in

[1] A clear and concise review of the present state of biological evolution will be found in Robert Heath Lock, *Variation, Heredity and Evolution* (New York, 1907).

mental development from the "longitudinal" point of view. Special studies in the mind of animals, of the child, and of primitive races are thus leading to a reconstruction of psychological theory, social as well as individual.[1]

In the light of these marked advances the question naturally arises as to the influence which these new views are bound to exert on the evolutionary theory of literary development. In the writer's opinion they point to the need of a total reconstruction of that theory which shall recognize all the factors involved and set these factors in their proper genetic relations to each other. Current theories are based almost entirely on the analogy with animal life. Popular and telling phrases borrowed from the science of biology have been applied, not always with due discrimination, to literary development. Not only does the notion of slow and gradual change in the transformation of literary species form the underlying assumption in most historical investigations, but where specific formulations of theory have been attempted, they have been couched, almost without exception, in biological terms. Critics have long been aware that factors such as individual talent or genius, having no analogues in the theory of organic evolution, are involved in the process of literary change. But a true conception of the part played by these factors is still a desideratum in literary theory, and it is upon precisely these factors that recent psychological investigation has thrown much needed light.

In great measure these strictures hold true of Ferdinand Brunetière's classic attempt to interpret literature in terms of heredity and environment and to apply the watchwords of biological evolution: *variation* and *the struggle for existence*, to literary development.[2] To be sure Brunetière did find a place for

[1] Countless articles in different languages have appeared within the last decade on various phases of this subject. The writer here can refer the reader to only a few books which by competent authority are regarded as nothing less than epoch-making and once for all acknowledge his indebtedness to them, not only for the ideas developed in this paper, but also for the terminology employed. They are: James Mark Baldwin, *Mental Development in the Child and the Race* (New York, 1895); *Social and Ethical Interpretations in Mental Development* (New York, 1897); and *Thoughts and Things or Genetic Logic* (New York), Vol. I, 1906, Vol. II, 1908. Vol. III which will deal with ethical and aesthetic values has not yet appeared.

[2] Cf. the Introduction to the English translation of his *Manuel de l'histoire de la littérature française* (1899), cited later on in this paper; and *L'évolution des genres dans l'histoire de la littérature française* (Paris, 1890).

the conscious personality in his system, although this factor is not found in a strictly biological theory of organic development. He considered individual talent or genius as ultimate factors, forms of variation analogous to spontaneous variation in biology, and averred that the chief merit of his system lay in the fact that it thus reconciled a theory of development with the "hero worship" of Carlyle and Coleridge. Recent psychological analysis shows, however, that it is only partially and provisionally justifiable to consider individual talent as an irreducible residuum. As Brunetière nowhere correlates the variation in the personality with the variation in the literary product, talent or genius still remains in his theory too much a force working *ab extra*, not genetically related with the other terms in his formula. A true correlation of all the factors involved in literary development will show that variation in biology and variation in literature are processes differing wholly in kind and condition. As a consequence it will follow that the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest are not phases of literary development in any sense truly analogous to natural selection in the biological world.

How closely the theory of literary development is linked with that of biological evolution is shown by Professor Manly's recent attempt[1] to apply the theory of mutations to the problem of specific and generic variation in literature. In a suggestive article, conservative in spirit and cautious in statement, Manly has utilized De Vries' theory to explain the origin of the mediaeval mysteries, miracle-plays, and moralities. Assuming that the essence of drama consists in impersonation, he has shown how the substitution of this element or character into the trope or antiphonal lyric of the Introit of the Easter Mass resulted in the mystery or liturgical Scripture play about 900 A. D. The significant point about this explanation is that the drama came into existence at a single bound and not by gradual gradations. Antiphonal singing in the church service suddenly becomes drama in the sense that a drama is the presentation of a story in action and the impersonation of the characters concerned in the story.

[1] "Literary Forms and the New Theory of the Origin of Species," *Modern Philology*, April, 1907.

In this sudden emergence of a new literary form Manly sees a striking analogy to De Vries' theory of the mutation of biological species, first published in 1899. According to this theory

> mutation forms a special division of the kinds of variation. It does not occur flowingly but in steps without transitional stages and it occurs less frequently than do the common variations which are continuously and constantly at hand. The contrast between the two kinds at once appears if one conceives that characters of an organism are made up of definite elements or units[1] sharply distinguished from one another. These units combine in groups, and in related species similar groups recur. Every addition of a unit to a group constitutes a step, originates a new group and separates the new form sharply and definitely as an individual species from the one out of which it has been produced.

Manly is careful not to substitute this analogy for a description of the real process. He expressly tells us that the "origin of new species not by the gradual accumulation of insensible differences but by a sudden definite change is true, not because it has been demonstrated for a species of plants but because certain literary forms, like certain species of plants, owe their distinctive character to the presence of one essential element." He does not deny that other literary forms may not come into existence by insensible gradations, although that proposition still remains to be proved. A new explanation of the manner in which biological species arise has helped him to free himself from the error of the current view that all literary forms came into being by slow and indefinite changes. He recognizes the fact that the biological analogy is not true in all points, for new combinations in literature are composed of previously existing elements, while the cause of mutation in plants and the addition of new elements is still unexplained.

In studying the facts of variation, literary as well as biological, two questions inevitably arise: the mode or manner of variation

[1] The conception that an organism is a mosaic made up of a definite number of units or characters was first broached by Weissmann as the result of his researches in cytology. The rediscovery of Mendel's law tends to confirm the correctness of the conception. According to this law there exists in organisms certain pairs of contrasting units or characters, both members of which cannot exist in the same individual or in the same species at the same time. But the individual units of each pair can be reproduced in combination with the individual members of other pairs in the cross-breeding of plants, thus giving rise to new varieties and new species.

and the cause of variation.[1] Manly has confined himself wholly to a single aspect in the manner and to a single aspect of the cause of variation in the literary product. After the manner of the scientists he has segregated a relatively small number of factors and has attempted to study their mutual relations. The two points which he makes, that of sudden and definite change in literary forms and the addition of some new character or unit as the cause of variation in the literary product, must be regarded as definite steps in advance, and will be confirmed, as we hope, by further examples cited in this paper. But this is only half of the story. As in most of the theories that rest upon biological analogy, there is the failure to reinstate the individual consciousness in its genetic relation to the other factors involved, and, as the result, the tendency to regard literary works too much in the light of organisms leading an independent existence of their own. If we are ever to obtain a true description of the process of literary change we must take some account of the *ego* in whose consciousness the change or the idea of the change first arose. In other words, we believe that the time has come when theories of literary development must be shifted from the biological to a psychological basis.

In using Manly's article as the starting-point of our own discussion let us guard against misapprehension. He deals with two very special points in literary variation, and it would be manifestly unjust to hold him responsible for that which he did not set out to do. In fact from private communication we know that he would give the personality due consideration in a complete account of literary change. The point which we wish to emphasize is simply this: so long as the theory of literary development rests on biological analogy and expresses its ideas in a biological nomenclature the function performed by personality in literary variation cannot be set in its true genetic relation to the other factors involved. And until the leading part played by the personality is recognized we can have neither a true nor a scientific account of the process of literary change. The individual consciousness is in reality the key to the whole situation. At the

[1] Cf. W. Bateson, *Materials for the Study of Variation* (1894).

risk of being somewhat trite we must therefore point out its place and function in the variation of literary forms.

No one, of course, has mistaken a work of art for an organism. But the consequences flowing from the essential difference between the two have not always been kept in mind by critics. In its simplest form an organism is a single living cell or collection of living cells propagating itself by means of division. The germ-cell of the young organism is developed in connection with the parent organism, in due time becomes detached, and then develops into a new organism of the same type. In some way or other by virtue of the connection of the germ-cell with the parent organism the essential qualities or characteristics of the type are transmitted from parent to offspring. This is physical heredity. In spite of this, however, variations do take place. No two organisms springing from the same parent are exactly alike; neither of them is exactly like the parent. Why, we do not know. Furthermore, according to the theory of mutations there comes a time when the young organisms differentiate in all directions from the parent organism. Physical heredity seems temporarily to lose its force. The discrepancies thus arising form the beginnings of new species, for these new and definite variations, apparently again by the force of physical heredity, perpetuate themselves, and if they be fitted for the environment in which they arise, will become established ultimately as the distinctive characteristics of a new species.

A work of art, on the other hand is, in its last analysis, but the sensuous sign or symbol for a psychic signification. It is simply the physical or material means by which the human *ego* makes itself intelligible to other human *egos*. Literature is, in reality, therefore a function of consciousness. The means employed is language, conventional signs, by means of which the ideas, emotions, and volitional impulses of the poet are conveyed to the hearer or reader. Literature is, thus, at once the product of psychic activity and the outcome of the social relations existing between men. The materials, which form the basis of communication are always some phase of human life. In the consciousness of the poet the elements making up this phase are combined in

such a way as to produce upon others essentially the same emotions which the poet himself experienced in combining them. Literature, then, is essentially a psychological and social product devised for the purpose of revealing the ethical and aesthetic values of human life. The mysterious process by which a relation is established between certain signs and certain ideas or emotions, or how it is that the perception of these symbols arranged in a certain way leads the *ego* to suffuse them with the same feelings which caused the speaker or writer to arrange them thus in the first place are questions for the psychologists to answer. Suffice it to observe that an organism and a literary work are fundamentally distinct. The latter does not exist in space except as a symbol; its period of duration is not limited by the time-span of organic life; it does not consist of cells nor propagate itself directly by division; in short, apart from the *ego* from which it sprang and from the *egos* to which it appeals, it cannot propagate itself at all. Without human society it simply could not exist.

If this conception of literature be correct, the question next arises: how does a literary type or species become established? In other words, how is a given species of a literary genus, say, the drama, perpetuated? Historians tell us that it was Christopher Marlowe who first introduced the variation which characterized the heroic tragedy of character, the type that dominated the Elizabethan period. We mean by this the dramatic species which regarded the individual as the maker of events, which held him to strict moral accountability, and which employed psychological analysis of character as the means of revealing the motives of human action—in a word, the type which lodged the force determining human fate in the individual will. Brunetière called it the psychological drama. We might define it as the tragedy of *psychological individualization*, for the individual was made to stand out as never before in the history of modern literature.

It was Shakspere who developed, elaborated, and perfected this type. By his great powers of observation and invention he raised individualization in poetry to a higher degree than any English dramatist before him, and at the same time uttered judgments on the significance of human conduct which it has taken

the English-speaking peoples until our own time fully to assimilate. In the sense then that both belong to the same species of tragedy, what is the real relation between Marlowe's works and Shakspere's plays? It cannot have been very different from the following. The great English poet by reading, seeing, perhaps by playing, the dramas of his predecessor, was so impressed by them that he made them in essential points the models for his own productions. Marlowe furnished the dramatic and verse form, the ethical point of view, the method of individualization which Shakspere adopted and developed. In other words, Marlowe's works were simply so much "copy" mentally assimilated by Shakspere to serve as the vehicles through which he might convey his own ideas, emotions, and volitional impulses to the public. This process is what the psychologists call "imitative selection," and in imitative selection the point to be emphasized is that the process is psychological, i. e., by conscious choice and imitation. This imitative propagation of ideas in society is a phenomenon for which biology shows no analogies. What survives in this case is not individuals, but *ideas*, and these do not survive necessarily in the form in which the first thinker conceived them, but in the form in which society applies them. Shakspere's perfected type has thus almost completely eclipsed the earlier efforts of Marlowe. Again the fitness of these ideas and forms to survive is not in any sense a fitness for struggle, but a fitness for imitative reproduction and application. Finally these ideas are not physically inherited but are simply handed down in symbolic form from generation to generation, as accretions to the store of tradition. This process of handing down the attainments of the fathers to the children is called by the psychologists "social heredity." From the surrounding social life each individual mentally assimilates "copies," patterns, examples, in the manner Shakspere learned from Marlowe, and in turn becomes a copy or a pattern from whom others can learn.

So far, then, as the analogy between variation in biology and variation in literature is concerned, a totally new factor is introduced into the latter. A personality is interposed, as the perpetuating and transposing medium, between every two generations of

the same literary species as well as between two related species. Shakspere's personality is the connecting link between the plays of Marlowe and the plays of Shakspere. Between the antiphonal lyric and the mediaeval *mystery* some individual consciousness was the medium. Biological development has no factor corresponding to this personality. Furthermore, this human *ego*, whenever it appears, finds itself face to face with a great body of traditions, conventions, forms, ideas, etc., from which it must learn and to which it must adjust itself. This constitutes its social heredity—environment stored in symbolic form, if you will—and social heredity is likewise a factor which finds no parallel in biological theory. The part played by the individual consciousness: its powers of selective imitation, its dependence on social heredity for the materials with which it works and its power of aesthetic invention or constructive imagination are therefore the cardinal factors to be emphasized in discussing the real process of variation in literature.

In considering now the conscious personality involved in the propagation and variation of literary species we must discriminate sharply on the one hand between the *powers* or *aptitudes* with which human consciousness is endowed, and the *content* of that consciousness on the other. The former is a question of the individual's *biological*, the latter a question of his *social*, heredity. These two questions must be kept distinctly apart, for it is just at this point that the biological analogy breaks down. The problem of the inventor or literary creator, considered as a human personality, is quite distinct from the problem of the artistic invention or product itself considered as a factor in literary development. As an organism the individual is amenable to biological law. As a member of society he, to a certain extent, is capable of transcending that law. He learns imitatively from a great number of traditions, institutions, conventions, etc.; he exercises an intellectual give-and-take with his fellow-men; in a word, he influences and is influenced by, his social environment—all of them functions not existing in the animal world, all of them factors of great importance in the production of art and literature. By the biological heredity of the individual we mean, therefore, the physical and

mental endowment by virtue of which he is able to learn from the traditions, institutions, etc., of his social environment, to rearrange and transpose the elements thus acquired in new combinations, and to eject the latter in literary or artistic form from his own consciousness.

This endowment, be it observed, is not the possession of certain chosen individuals; it is, to a degree, common to all the individuals making up the same society. Between the average man and the genius biological heredity shows wide divergence; but it is a difference of degree, not of kind. What distinguishes the genius from ordinary men is a greater capacity to learn by imitative selection from his natural and social environment, a greater power of aesthetic invention, and an ability in his judgments to anticipate the literary or aesthetic judgments which will be approved by society—in other words, assimilated and in turn made part of the social, more particularly the literary, heredity of the race. He is not endowed with any special faculties differentiating him from other men. He is a human type or variety, not a new psychological species. To put the matter in technical terms, the poet or man of letters is one whose aesthetic consciousness has been developed to the "ejective" stage. Psychologists tell us that the human *ego* passes through three stages in the development of self-consciousness. During the first stage the child, born with certain hereditary capacities or aptitudes, has to feel or grope its way amid its physical and social environment. It is subject to a thousand and one reactions upon stimuli from without which it does not thoroughly comprehend nor understand. This is the *projective* stage. After a time, by dint of repetition and imitation the human *ego* makes these impressions its own, assimilates them to its own consciousness; by virtue of its previous experience, learns to understand them. This is the *subjective* stage. Finally, in the third stage, it is able, so to speak, to eject these subjective assimilations in new combinations toward without and to use them as the norms by which it judges and influences society around it. Aesthetically speaking, we may say that the average man is the one who has reached the subjective stage of development. He can understand and assimilate in some measure the artistic produc-

tions of others. This process, in fact, constitutes one of the chief factors in education. But the literary producer is the man who feels his volitional impulses stirred to eject these subjective assimilations in some literary form, traditional or new, out of his own consciousness, that he, in turn, may make impressions upon his fellow-men.

The explanation of the individual's biological heredity is not, strictly speaking, a problem for the literary critic. He may be content to define or describe its peculiar characteristics as they are manifested in the individual's artistic productions. The critic is, however, bound to use all the means furnished by biology and psychology to interpret correctly this fundamental element in the personality of the poet or artist. Why the personality in question is endowed as it is and how it came to be so endowed are problems for the biologists and psychologists to solve. That some sort of parallelism exists between the brain and nerve centers, on the one hand, and the inventive power or constructive imagination, on the other, will be admitted by all. We may further assume with the biometricians, such as Galton and Karl Pearson, that mental characteristics are transmitted from parents to offspring in the same ratio as physical characteristics, and make the so-called creative power of the poet or artist a problem of heredity and variation. But when we recall that in the development of the human race—at least since it began to be civilized—there is no struggle for existence, no survival of the fittest, at best only a suppression of the socially unfit, and therefore no natural selection tending to perpetuate certain characteristics which have proved their utility to the individual and to society, the question of a given mental endowment in a given individual is practically, at least in the present state of science, insoluble.

So far, then, as the biological heredity of the individual enters into literary variation as the producing cause, we may agree with Brunetière that the individuality of the poet is a variation, at present an irreducible *residuum* which we have to assume as a given factor. Future discoveries in evolution and psychology may enable us to explain this factor. Nevertheless the importance of the function which it performs, as well as its genetic relation to

the other elements involved, should not be overlooked. As the transposing medium in which literary variation takes place the individuality not only plays a part which must be reckoned with in any true account of the process, but it often furnishes the very best point of view from which to interpret and judge a literary work. Lying, as it does, between the writer's social environment and his productions, reflecting so to speak, his social and literary heredity, the personality often offers the best coign of vantage from which to understand his works, especially where a study of his life in detail is possible. Here, as from no other point, the critic may learn exactly what elements or units a given personality prefers to assimilate from its social environment. From this viewpoint the peculiar transposing and combining power of the author's *ego* may be most profitably observed. It is just this attention paid to the personality of the writer which makes Sainte-Beuve's work rank so high as criticism, and it was just this element, as we take it, that even a *naturalist* like Zola meant to emphasize, when he defined a work of art as a phase of human life *seen across a human temperament.* One observation in conclusion which brings clearly to light the discrepancy between variation in the personality and variation in the literary product. We have said above that the human *ego* which brings its aesthetic consciousness to the ejective stage of development, compared with its development in the average individual represents a difference only of degree and not of kind. This constant or fluctuating variation of the *ego* does not form the distinguishing characteristic of a new human species. In other words, the genius is not a genius because he possesses qualities or characteristics which other men do not, for if he did, these qualities could not be brought to other men's consciousness. He is a genius by virtue of the fact that the qualities which he has in common with all men are developed to a much higher degree than is ordinarily the case.

On the other hand, it must be admitted that variation in literature, whether definite or indefinite, depends directly on the aesthetic inventive power of the individual producing it. If this be conceded, how then does it come about that what at most must be considered as constant, continuous, indefinite variation in the *ego*

produces definite, discontinuous variation in the product wide enough to characterize a new literary species or even genus? The only answer to this question is that variations in literature cannot, in the last analysis, be measured by the same standard as variations in biology, because another factor—social heredity—is involved. If they could, then a definite mutating variation in literature must likewise have a definite mutating cause in the *ego* which produced it. In that case a poet like Marlowe, or the mediaeval monk who substituted an individual for the part previously taken by a choir in the church liturgy, must likewise have represented, biologically speaking, a specific or generic variation of the human *ego*. The fact is that the biological parallelism simply breaks down. The producing cause of literary variation in the inventive power of the human consciousness must be measured in different terms from the variation in the literary product itself. The old truth is only emphasized more sharply that, in the application of an analogy drawn from one realm to the phenomena of another, in the transfer of the terminology of a science into the domain of art the finest discrimination is necessary, if the real relation of the factors involved is not to be obscured rather than clarified.

But the question of the mental endowment of the individual—his biological heredity—is only one half of the story of variation in literature. As has been already observed the whole content of consciousness is learned by experience. The human *ego* brings with it into the world no ideas, no items of knowledge, no beliefs, no emotions. It has simply an endowment of aptitudes or powers by means of which it acquires all these through the process of psychological assimilation, or, technically speaking, through selective imitation. All that the individual learns, he learns from his physical and social environment, from his social heredity as the psychologists say. He can create nothing in the absolute sense. He can only transpose and recombine the elements acquired. A *maker* the poet may be, but the materials of which he forms his constructions all owe their origin to a region exterior to his own consciousness. It is with the part played by social heredity in literary variation that we have to deal here. This is the sphere of

historical investigation. Here the historical critic finds his justification. From this point of view variation in literature becomes a solvable problem, both in regard to the manner as well as to the cause of variation.

The content of literary consciousness embraces a knowledge of materials, forms, and emotions. This content is drawn not only from literary tradition but from all the phases of life with which the individual producer comes in contact. When Brunetière tells us that tradition is the strongest factor in literary production, he simply means that the vast majority of writers learn far more from the materials, emotions, and forms used by their predecessors than they add as the result of their own observation and invention. A purely reproductive nature like Lessing simply repeats the same forms, uses the same motives, and reproduces the same emotional effects that are found in the European drama around him. The characters in his mature dramas, his beliefs, ideas, and some of his incidents he did draw by direct observation from contemporary life. But the significant point here is that from this study of a writer's literary and social heredity the cause of variation in a given work of art may be understood. It will be found to consist, as Manly has shown in the case of the mediaeval drama, in the combination of elements hitherto kept separate. So far as the source of these elements can be traced, we can reach definite conclusions regarding the influence which contemporary thought is exerting upon literature. In fact, where literary production rests too much on literary tradition it means that it is becoming conventional and stereotyped, i. e., losing vital connection with the life around it. Variation in literature may be defined as an attempt more or less constant to adjust literature to the demands of contemporary thought and feeling. Very few of the adjustments attempted prove of lasting value, either because the innovators do not possess the requisite inventive power or because their social heredity does not furnish them with ideas significant enough to cause permanent mutations. Only writers with exceptional opportunities will achieve variations of permanent influence. Thus the Elizabethan drama of psychological individualization followed directly as the result of the individualistic elements introduced by the Reforma-

tion. The conception of man as individually responsible to his conscience for his conduct and of his own will as the determining force in his life were beliefs underlying Protestant theology. This example will serve to emphasize the fact to be kept in mind here. The inventions and new combinations made by any writer rest on the acquisitions and generalizations of his people at the time he creates. Only on this basis can they be properly interpreted and understood. Only such inventions and combinations as prove of utility or are capable of verification in the experience of those for whom they are made will long endure.

The content of consciousness, as we have observed, is made up of certain ideas, items of knowledge, impressions of personalities, ethical convictions, religious beliefs, etc. Arising as a function to this content there will be certain emotions, appreciations of value, and volitional impulses. Now the peculiarity about the aesthetic or poetic state of consciousness is that the form which the content assumes is determined by the emotions or appreciations which arise as its function. As Alfred Stevens once put it, "Art is nature seen through the prism of an emotion." The power of aesthetic invention or of constructive imagination consists therefore in the arrangement of materials or of unit characters in such a way as to produce an emotional effect, to arouse appreciation. If this be true that emotional effect or appreciation of values is the determining factor as well as the end in literature, the question naturally arises: Why not study literature from the emotional or appreciative point of view? Theoretically there could be no objection to such a mode of procedure and in fact this is what the aesthetic critic and the impressionist often try to do. But practically such a course is beset with insuperable difficulties. States of appreciation that pronounce a literary work artistically "good" or "bad" are what the psychologists call "private meanings," that is to say, they form those aspects of consciousness which fulfil some relatively *personal* interest, satisfaction, or purpose. There is, therefore, no direct process of rendering them in terms of predication. Judgments of fact or of truth are correct or incorrect and their correctness or incorrectness can be logically demonstrated. But predicates of worth cannot be objectively determined. The latter are, on the one hand, so abstract that

they cannot be placed in a setting of recognitive meaning and, on the other, so concrete that they can be learned only directly at first hand by experience. Put technically they are a-logical or hyper-logical.[1] They escape all the formulations of reflective judgment. Psychologists have, as yet, discovered no terms into which human emotion can be transformed like sound into atmospheric waves or light into undulations of ether. Evolution has not yet registered the emotions in the chronological order of their appearance nor has it furnished a genetics of the same. All the classifications made by psychologists of whatever school are, at most, arbitrary and mechanical arrangements adapted for some practical purpose. They all rest on an imperfect attempt at analysis and an unsatisfactory method of description. The net proceeds of these efforts amount, therefore, to a certain number of tolerably well-marked emotions, generally recognized, for which certain terms are used. But this forms only a foundation of shifting sand upon which to build up a theory of literary criticism. The impressionist whose soul is delicately responsive to all the stimuli of *the true*, *the beautiful*, and *the good* may indeed perform a service in registering the emotional effects produced by a work of art. But in the main he has no means of verifying his results except his own subjective impressionism. If others do not feel the same effects he has no means of convincing them. His own ability as a writer and producer of such effects will help him little. For the discriminating reader will not be bribed by the mere charm of style into accepting opinions which his own study of the original under consideration does not verify.

The position assumed here does not imply that the power of appreciation is not possessed in common by all the members of society. The very presupposition of all psychology, that the "commonness of common function produces common experience" precludes this. Nor does it mean that "aesthetic" criticism is without its due weight and influence. Fads and fashions in literature prove that there are catholic or aggregate movements. Such

[1] An interesting article by W. M. Urban on a sort of "appreciative description" whereby such meanings may be indirectly suggested by verbal description may be found in the *Philosophical Review*, November, 1905. In Vol. II of his *Thoughts and Things*, Professor Baldwin has made some interesting observations on these attitudes of consciousness (pp. 166, 282, 348, 389).

"criticism" may carry the day, but it does it, not by criticism proper, that is, an appeal to reflective judgment, but as literature itself works, by setting up examples for unreflective imitation, by suggestion, by assertion, and by the "damnable force of reiteration" itself. What this position does imply is that it is not possible to argue about tastes and that no scientific theory of literary criticism can be founded upon the basis of aesthetic appreciation.

Those elements in literature which are amenable to the logical modes of consciousness, the manner of their combination with the resultant forms and effects, constitutes therefore the only objective basis for literary study, the only point of view from which valid principles of criticism can be derived. These elements can be analyzed into the ideas, ethical convictions, religious beliefs, types of character, actions, incidents, etc., and be historically fixed and defined. The peculiar manner of their combination will give rise to certain appreciations and the relation of elements or unit characters to each other will constitute what we know as form. The source of these materials, emotions, and forms will be found to be partly traditional, i. e., found already as accepted combinations in the earlier literature of the nation and partly new, i. e., drawn directly from contemporary life by the writer's powers of observation and assimilation. It is the business of the critic therefore to study these elements—unit characters, if you will—traditional as well as new, to trace them to their source, and to analyze carefully the process of their combination, not only in the work itself but as far as possible in the consciousness of the producing individual. In this wise he may hope to gain a true knowledge of the process of literary variation, to find the true key to literary interpretation, and to lay the best foundation for a literary standard of judgment.

Let us now attempt to apply this psychological theory to the study of a recent variation in the drama. Manly's example of the mutation of the mediaeval *mystery* might serve the purpose were it not that the lack of detailed information in regard to the personality involved as well as to his social heredity renders it practically impossible to get at the facts. Such historical lacunae do not render the part played by these factors any less real, but it is just this lack of detailed information which has rendered the

application of biological analogy to remote ages easy. Evolution can be applied to past more readily than to modern times largely because so many factors are lost from view in the course of time. This fact undoubtedly simplifies the problem, but in so far forth invalidates the result, because effects may easily be attributed to fewer and simpler causes than were actually involved in the case. An application of the analogy to some contemporary variation is therefore likely to prove much more instructive. If the detailed knowledge we possess complicates the problem, it is, on the other hand, much more likely to bring to light the missing links in the analogy.

In 1889 Gerhart Hauptmann[1] launched the *naturalistic* drama in Germany in his realistic picture of the evil effects of drink entitled *Before Sunrise*. This play was the first of a series extending to the year 1895, all of which stand in striking contrast to the type hitherto prevailing. It was Schiller who established the "heroic drama of character" in Germany, for all his tragedies with only one exception (*The Bride of Messina*) belong to the drama of psychological individualization. The new elements or unit characters which Schiller added, namely his cosmopolitan ideal of human liberty and his sympathy for the struggling middle classes, were not units important enough to cause specific variation in the traditional Renaissance type, first perfected by Shakspere. But in the *naturalistic* tragedy of Hauptmann, the forces employed to furnish the motive power of the action, the plot as well as the method of characterization and aesthetic invention, mark a discontinuous and definite variation, wide enough, we think, to characterize a new dramatic species.

In its theoretical form *naturalism* represents nothing but a conscious reaction against the ultra-classicism and the ultra-individualism of the preceding generations. The modern scientific spirit with its love of facts and inferences from facts as well as the intensity of modern social conflicts had materially altered the traditional conception of the individual's place in society. The consciousness of the discrepancy between the established dramatic

[1] Cf. Otto Heller, *Studies in Modern German Literature*, pp. 117–229 (Boston, 1905). Of course the writer here is citing Hauptmann's earlier works as the first examples of a literary variation in Germany. He is aware that Hauptmann was not the first *naturalist* in Europe.

interpretation of human action and its real significance led to a new attempt to unite poetry and actual life. Hauptmann was the first man of genuine poetic talent in Germany to make this attempt with success. He is therefore justly reckoned as the founder of a new school, the personality in whose consciousness a literary mutation was accomplished, resulting in a new species of tragedy —the *naturalistic.*

In its extreme form *naturalism* admitted no qualitative distinction to exist between art and nature; it simply attempted to reproduce nature as it presents itself to the scientist or ordinary man. Accordingly, a work of art is therefore only a copy of nature which is judged as good in proportion as it is exact and faithful. Now this attempt of the dramatist to look at nature—for be it remembered, in the eyes of the *naturalists*, human life also is only an integral part of nature—from a strictly objective point of view, had many important consequences. Man as the maker of events, manifesting the power of human volition, was at once eliminated. For the freedom of the will naturalism substituted a determinism by which man's destiny is the inevitable outcome of two forces: his inherited characteristics or aptitudes and his environment. Hauptmann has no heroes in the traditional sense of the word. He shows us no overpowering personalities. He overlooks human inventive power and the volitional energy which makes new combinations and inventions factors in social progress. In all these earlier dramas man is little more than a passive link in the chain of social phenomena.

If man's life is but the product of heredity and environment and human fate the resultant of a parallelogram of extrinsic forces then, of course, moral responsibility disappears; the much-mooted tragic guilt and tragic expiation of the drama are simply nonexistent. The most that the dramatist can do is to paint the environment in great detail and trace its influence on individuals of a certain hereditary character, depicted for us, likewise, by a mass of detail. Without human volition directed by intelligence, a plot consisting of a beginning, a middle, and an end, developing logically from stage to stage, and forming a coherent totality, cannot exist, for such an action is contrary to all *naturalistic* pre-

suppositions, and cannot be found in nature. A tragic conflict in the accepted sense cannot take place, and the catastrophe when it comes must be the result of purely natural forces. In Hauptmann's earlier dramas, we find no unity of action; at times even hardly definiteness of structure. They consist, notably *The Weavers*, of a series of disconnected episodes which somehow or other simply come to an end without attaining finality.

Now, we might go still farther and point out how this suppression of the human will has affected Hauptmann's method of presentation. Where all is externalized, there can be no place for pyschological analysis of character so prominent in Shakspere and Schiller. We gain no insight into the motives which impel his characters to action. For consistently they can be moved only by the forces of heredity and environment, and the essence of Hauptmann's art consists in the patient observation and reproduction of external detail. In his comedy *Colleague Crampton*, for example, critics have never been able to decide whether his hero is a genuine artist or only a boastful pretender, so little of his inner life has been revealed. The appearance of truth to life is produced by the mass of detail and minutiae which the poet's power of observation enables him to bring before the reader. All internal development of character is lost and no new ideas are ever evolved in the course of the action.

Indeed, to a certain extent Hauptmann's choice of materials is the logical result of his biological point of view, although altruistic considerations also are doubtless involved here. If man's destiny is the outcome of heredity and environment, then it is only natural that the poet should seek to depict those phases of life in which these forces manifest themselves most emphatically. He accordingly draws his materials logically from the dismal region of the fourth estate, for here, as nowhere else, the tragic consequences of inherited evil proclivities and unfavorable surroundings show themselves in their most glaring colors. At any rate we would do the philanthropic as well as the artistic purpose of the *naturalists* rank injustice to suppose that their dismal studies in black and gray were merely the result of an unnatural desire to shock us with repulsive pictures.

Lastly, be it observed, the emotions these *naturalistic* tragedies arouse in us are quite distinct from the traditional pity and fear of the heroic tragedy of character. Hauptmann's tragedies may be said to arouse sympathy and pity, but this sympathy and pity is altruistic. In the traditional tragedy pity arises from the fact that we see ourselves in the suffering hero. He appeals to us by virtue of the universal human element common to him and to us. We imagine ourselves in his place. This pity is egoistic. In Hauptmann the objective, economic, and social as contrasted with the universally human point of view forbids this. Pity arises from the altruistic and social attitude. It is a feeling *for*, not a feeling *with*, suffering humanity, something much more nearly akin to common Christian sympathy than to the tragic fear and pity of either Shakspere or Aristotle.

As we are not concerned here with an appreciation of Hauptmann's dramas, enough has been said to show that a tragedy without the traditional hero, without unity of action, without human will, and consequently without tragic guilt and tragic expiation, a tragedy whose method of presentation rests on observation of external detail and not on psychological analysis of character and whose emotional means of appealing to us are altruistic rather than egoistic, certainly represents a literary variation definite enough to be reckoned as a mutation. A new species of tragedy has come suddenly into existence. The tragedy of *psychological individualization* has been supplanted by one of *biological socialization:* man but a link in the biological chain, his life to be interpreted from the objective point of view in terms of heredity and environment. Whether this new form will become established as a permanent dramatic species the future alone will determine. But its success on the stage and its influence on all modern literatures cannot be doubted. The question of the success or failure of this variation, however, is of no moment here. The problem that concerns us is how this sudden change is to be explained; what factors have been at work to cause this sudden mutation in the German drama. This problem can be satisfactorily answered only in the psychological terms already elucidated. The detailed knowledge of Hauptmann's life will perhaps throw some light on the manner and cause of the mutation of species in literature.

Hauptmann's mental endowment or biological heredity, as we have already observed, is, strictly speaking, a problem for the biologist to solve. The most that the critic can hope to do is to define the sphere of its imitative selection and to point out the peculiarities in its method of aesthetic invention. A glance at the sources from which the poet has drawn the content of his poetic consciousness may also furnish some hints looking toward a possible explanation of these powers. As the producing cause of the *naturalistic* variation in the drama then, Hauptmann's peculiar individuality may be summed up in a few sentences. His power of imitative selection has led him to reject the dramatic traditions of his people and to assume a point of view which is essentially biological and social in the technical sense of those words. This statement holds true not only of his dramatic content but also of his method of characterization and presentation, i. e., of his manner of aesthetic invention. The strictly objective viewpoint assumed leads him naturally to draw his materials by direct observation from contemporary life. For great historical personages and great historical events he seems to have no understanding. He is a soul completely out of joint with transmitted literary conceptions. His dependence on the direct observation of physical details for the materials with which he works has fettered his power of aesthetic invention. He seems totally deficient in the power of psychological analysis, abstraction, and generalization, and produces his realistic effects by making one detail deftly follow another until the whole is conjured up before us. Lastly, be it observed, his choice of materials as well as manner of aesthetic invention are conditioned by emotions and appreciations which are essentially altruistic and social. Not only are his materials drawn from the life of down-trodden humanity but his scenes are depicted chiefly to appeal to those feelings known as philanthropic.

Hauptmann's inability to analyze and abstract comes glaringly to light in his one attempt to deal with materials in any sense historical. In his *Florian Geyer* he aimed to depict scenes from the Peasant Revolts which occurred in the sixteenth century. On the stage this drama was a conspicuous failure. For the poet here, where it was necessary to analyze and single out the dom-

inant characteristics in a picture, the details of which have long been lost, not only failed to produce a real environment but his characters also do not give us the same impression of reality as in the plays depicting contemporary life. In other words, Hauptmann seems unable to create types. He strives rather to present society *en masse*. He loves a crowd of figures, each figure representing some characteristic of the class and all taken together forming, as it were, a composite picture. On the other hand, this prodigious power to observe details is one of the chief elements which has made Hauptmann an unrivaled master in interpreting some of the subtler moods of nature. In the region of the semi-human, of the fairy, the faun, and the satyr, in the realm of fantastic idealism, first depicted in the *Sunken Bell*, Hauptmann's exquisite sensibility to every external impression, his accurate eye for the slightest detail, makes him the superior of every German poet in producing what is known in Germany as a *Stimmmungsbild*, a term whose significance can be only imperfectly translated into English by the word "atmosphere."

What peculiar variation of brain and nerve center has thus rendered the poet subject to the stimuli of a scientific conception of the universe, has made him sympathize with the struggles of the working classes, and has rendered him aesthetically so sensitive to the minutest detail, we do not know. So far as his lineage is concerned we can only observe that his father and grandfather were innkeepers at a once popular Silesian watering-place. They were men marked by no special intellectual endowments, but known for their energy, honor, and thrift. As practical men of affairs they cherished no peculiar educational ideas, and so far as Hauptmann himself is concerned he is in no sense the heir of inbred classical tradition. This may help to account negatively for his indifference to classical literary models and for his interest in living social problems. Hauptmann's mother was of Moravian extraction. She was likewise a woman of practical bent, with a deep religious vein. She represents that calm, introspective, and at the same time evangelical type of religion which has made the Moravian sect one of the chief actors in modern missionary and philanthropic enterprises. From her, Hauptmann may well have

inherited much of his sympathy for the struggling masses of society and much of his fine sensibility to external impressions. In spite of its suppression in his earlier works there is also a vein of mysticism in Hauptmann's nature which he may likewise owe to his mother. This is shown not only in his power to reproduce some of the subtler moods of nature, but it comes clearly to light in some of his later works where he strives to give expression to an almost mystical idealism by means of rather fantastic symbols. But why Hauptmann should be devoid of logical analyzing power is still a mystery.

Turning now to the element of *social heredity* involved, we shall see at once that his environment and education have at least furnished an atmosphere favorable to the development of the peculiar aptitudes manifested in the choice of his literary materials and in the peculiar manner of their combination. At the outset it should be observed that he spent his boyhood in a Silesian village. Here the poet was thrown into direct contact with the misery and woe of the down-trodden weaver class, and at this time he doubtless received many of those realistic impressions of poverty, misery, and vice which he has reproduced so vividly in his dramas. It will be recalled further that the formative period of Hauptmann's life fell just at the time when German science had reached its most dogmatic stage. A sensitive nature, such as his, might easily become saturated with its spirit, without mastering its achievements, for the assumption that Hauptmann's thinking was greatly influenced by his education does not seem warranted by the facts. He was sent to the *Realschule* at Breslau. To say that he was an indifferent student there is only to put it mildly. The course of study included neither Latin nor Greek but laid the chief emphasis on the modern languages and the sciences. The atmosphere of the school may have been one of the sources from which he unconsciously imbibed his modernism. But so far as specific studies are concerned they seem to have made no impression. He was too stupid to learn mathematics, and his soul, so sensitive to impressions from without, was never able to assimilate the logical formulations of human wisdom classified in approved textbooks and doled out in diurnal doses by patient and long-

suffering pedagogues. In fact, Hauptmann as a student was a complete failure, noted for nothing except his ability to write German. When allowed to attend the University of Jena—he was not competent to matriculate—we hear only of some historical lectures which he is supposed to have listened to, and of his great interest in aesthetic and social questions, which he discussed frequently with his friends. His subsequent attempt to become an artist shows further his artistic bent.

During his formative period likewise the struggle between capital and labor in Germany was growing more acute. The Social Democratic movement, still in its theoretical and dogmatic stage, was steadily gaining in strength. The questions raised by the advocates of this movement, the idealistic theories of social reform advocated, served to bring out the glaring inequalities that existed in Germany's industrial and social organization. That the son of Silesian village innkeepers, who was already familiar with the woes suffered by the much-neglected weaver class, should feel his heart moved to sympathy is not surprising. After his settlement in Berlin Hauptmann became intimate with some of the prominent socialists in that city. Aesthetic and social problems have ever since been his chief concern.

If we ask now from what literary source Hauptmann drew poetic inspiration we find that he was led into *naturalism* chiefly under the influence of Arno Holz. This poet impressed Hauptmann very much with his clear and incisive analysis of existing literary conditions. Holz and his talented friend Johannes Schlaf, had conjointly written a book of photographically lifelike sketches entitled *Papa Hamlet.* This book was written directly under the influence of Zola's teaching and example. Hauptmann regarded this work as the very acme of consistent *naturalism* and under its inspiration and example he produced the first *naturalistic* drama in Germany. So far, then, as his general point of view is concerned, it can be traced in its literary form back to Zola. In developing it, Hauptmann has come farther under the influence of Ibsen and Nietzsche. We may sum up, then, by saying that while the explanation of Hauptmann's personality still remains largely an unsolved problem, his peculiar endowments have found

in the scientific, social, and literary movements of the environment elements well adapted to their use and development. In a word, his biological has conformed to his social heredity, and from the mutual accommodation of these two factors his works and their influence can best be explained.

If now we turn to the question of variation in this drama itself, considered as an aesthetic product, we can detect at once the new unit or character which has caused the mutation. In the light of what has been said it can be nothing else than the changed location of the forces determining human destiny. In the drama of psychological individualization we saw that this determining force was lodged in the individual will. In the drama of biological socialization it has been transferred to human heredity and human environment. The different location of this force has in each case led directly to specific variations in the structure, form, and emotional effects of the drama; has, in a word, become the cause of a mutating variation. Human fate determined by heredity and environment has been substituted for human fate determined by the individual will. These two ideas, like the pairs of contrasting unit characters in biology, are to a great extent antagonistic. The predominance of one or the other becomes the definite characteristic by virtue of which two related dramatic species can be distinguished and identified. This may be illustrated still further. Lodge the force governing human life in some occult power, inscrutable and unfathomable to mortal ken, let this power announce itself in dreams, omens, etc., and we have the Fate tragedy of the Greeks. Let the determining force rest upon happy coincidence or blind chance, and there results the drama of accident, one of the frequent types of comedy and, so far as the relation of plot to characterization is concerned, the exact parallel of the Fate tragedy.

The point to be emphasized here is, that the different location of the controlling force brings with it in each case differences in the structure, characterization, and emotional effects. In other words, the new unit character causing the mutation is accompanied by units of lesser importance and the peculiar correlation of these units forms the differentiating characteristics of a given dramatic species.

The source from which this new unit element in the naturalistic drama was drawn is obvious. We have seen that Hauptmann owed it in its literary form indirectly to Zola. But we know that this new point of view is only the cardinal induction of modern evolution. The union of its fundamental biological conception with the drama is only a proof of the far-reaching consequences following the modern scientific movement. The drama of biological socialization is the example of the influence of science upon literature which Dowden was seeking, but did not find, when he published his essay, "Science and Literature," in 1885. The cause of variation, we see, was the addition of a unit character drawn from some source other than literature itself. In the case of the drama of psychological individualization the specific changes taking place were the result of an idea developed by Protestant theology. In like manner the rise of the Fate tragedy in Greece doubtless marks also the predominance of a philosophic or religious idea evolved in the course of man's efforts to probe the mystery of human destiny. In each case the change in the drama was sudden and definite, but it had long been prepared for in other realms of human thought and simply awaited the individual with inventive power enough to combine new elements with traditional literary forms.

As the net proceeds, then, of this long disquisition, we believe with Manly that variations in literature definite enough to distinguish different species, or even genera, do take place suddenly, because our historical information will often enable us to name the individual who wrought the change, as well as to specify the year in which the change took place. Without attempting to solve the vexed question of what constitutes a specific difference—a question which even biology has not solved satisfactorily—and waiving the problem of origins, we may venture the opinion that even the origin and date of indefinite and constant variations may be fixed in the same way. The fact that most changes in literature marking only differences of variety or type usually reflect some movement in contemporary thought makes this possible. But our chief contention is that, however this be, the process of variation in literature can be interpreted adequately

only in psychological terms. Only one factor involved, that of the assimilating and inventive power of the human *ego*, depends for its solution upon strictly biological conditions. But as this very factor is one which has no parallel in the process of the propagation of organisms proper, theories of literary development based on biological analogy find no terms in which to reinstate this fundamental element in its genetic relation to the other elements. Moreover, the social heredity of every human individual has no analogue in the animal world. The process by which the materials of social heredity are utilized in literary production is likewise psychological. So far as we can now tell it has nothing in common with physical heredity.

While this psychological explanation of literary variation does not settle all the difficulties, it has, it seems to us, two very decided advantages. By setting all the factors involved in their real genetic relation to each other it furnishes a simple formula according to which literary phenomena may be classified, and it reconciles what have too often been conflicting points of view. It shows that the aesthetic, biographical, and historical methods of literary criticism are after all only three integral and organic parts of one and the same thing. These phases cannot and ought not to be separated in any really scientific investigation. The application of this same psychological point of view to the problem of natural selection in literature is likewise bound, we believe, to transform the current notions of the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest in letters.

JOHN PRESTON HOSKINS

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

CHAUCER'S ALCESTE

The bounds of allegorical interpretation have never been fixed and are, indeed, unfixable. The burden of proof is, of course, on the advocate of any such interpretation; but the trouble is that, when a particular suggestion of this kind has been put into type, it becomes a kind of dogma, and everybody expects those who reject it to "preven the contrarye." Those unfortunate persons who, like myself, require a modicum of applicability in a supposed allegorical figure, are obliged to take the offensive. Yet to fight with an allegory is like wrestling with a phantom. In fact, I do not know how one can actually prove that Alceste in the Prologue to Chaucer's *Legend of Good Women* does not stand for Queen Anne unless one can demonstrate that Queen Anne never did exist at all.

Still, something may be done to expose, I will not say the absurdity of the theory itself, but rather the absurdity which that theory ascribes to Chaucer.[1]

May we not take it for granted that Chaucer at the age of forty-five or so, after a long course of reading in allegorical literature and a considerable production of such literature on his own part, was able to construct an allegory that should not stand in glaring contrast with the concrete facts of the case? And furthermore, is it not altogether probable that, in a complimentary identification, he would have instinctively shunned disagreeable implications? Surely he had at least the ordinary amount of tact.

Keeping these two points in mind, let us read the following passage:

> "Hastow nat in a book, lyth in thy cheste,
> The grete goodnesse of the quene Alceste,
> That turned was into a dayesye:
> She that for hir husbonde chees to dye,
> And eek to goon to helle, rather than he,
> And Ercules rescued hir, pardee,

[1] Compare the arguments of Professor Lowes in opposition to the current theory (*Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, XIX, 666 ff.), and of Professor Tatlock in support of it (*The Development and Chronology of Chaucer's Works*, pp. 102 ff.).

> And broghte hir out of helle agayn to blis?"
> And I answered ageyn, and seyde, "Yis,
> Now knowe I hir! And is this good Alceste,
> The dayesye, and myn owne hertes reste?
> Now fele I wel the goodnesse of this wyf,
> That both after hir deeth, and hir lif,
> Hir grete bountee doubleth hir renoun!
> —B, 510 ff.; A, 498 ff.

How is it possible that Chaucer should have written this if he meant Alceste to stand for a queen who was but nineteen or twenty years old, full of the joy of life, and the center of a brilliant court? Would she have been pleased? Would the king have accepted the picture as a graceful tribute to his much-loved wife? We may go farther. Would it have entered the mind of the king or the queen or any of the courtiers that Chaucer intended anything of the kind? I know this was the Middle Ages. Still, "men were flesh and blood and apprehensive" in mediæval times. Human nature does not seem to have changed a great deal in the last five or six hundred years. We can still understand Chaucer pretty well, and can generally surmise what he was driving at. But this passes everything. "Naught but itself can be its parallel."

Again, what a queer whimsy that was of the poet's, if he meant Alceste in the Prologue to be identified with Queen Anne, to put into her mouth the injunction—

> And whan this book is maad, yive it the quene,
> On my behalfe, at Eltham or at Shene!
> —B, 495–97.

If he had feared that some ingenious interpreter might fancy that Alceste *was* meant for Queen Anne, and had wished to forestall such a misapprehension, he could hardly have done it better. But, unfortunately, he did not reckon with us moderns, whom, when we are in hot pursuit of a source or a date, nothing short of a denial under oath will satisfy.

The passages just quoted are forcible enough in themselves, but their significance as applying only to the actual Alceste in her own proper character comes out with peculiar strength when we remember that Chaucer had already spoken of her in almost identical terms in the *Troilus*.

As wel thou mightest lyen on Alceste,
That was of creatures—but men lye—
That ever weren, kindest and the beste;
For whanne hir housbonde was in iupartye
To dye himself but-if she wolde dye,
She chees for him to dye and go to helle,
And starf anoon, as us the bokes telle.
—v, 1527 ff.

And later in the same book Chaucer looks forward to the time when he may perhaps celebrate Alceste in verse:

And gladlier I wol wryten, if yow leste
Penelopeës trouthe, and good Alceste.
—v, 1777, 1778.

When Chaucer wrote these passages in the *Troilus* he certainly had no idea of equating Queen Anne with Alceste. Nobody contends that he had. It passes one's comprehension to understand how so infelicitous a notion should ever have entered his head afterward. Positive evidence in the affirmative is surely required in so extraordinary a case.

There is still another passage which throws some light upon the subject. Chaucer's plan was, apparently, to make the story of Alceste the concluding legend of the series. Love lays a specific injunction upon him to that effect:

But now I charge thee, upon thy lyf,
That in thy legend thou make of this wyf,
Whan thou hast othere smale ymaad before.
B, 548–50; A, 538–40.

Surely, if Alceste was understood by the court to be Queen Anne, this plan was fraught with embarrassments and perplexities of every kind. So long as Alceste was merely a character in an allegorical prologue, it is perhaps conceivable—barely conceivable—that Chaucer should have meant her to typify the queen. But how could such a clumsy and inapplicable fiction survive a concrete biographical narrative of the real Alceste's death and of her recovery from the Land of Shades? If Alceste is merely Alceste and nobody else, her story was, in every detail, eminently fitting as the acme of a series of examples illustrating the fidelity of women and their martyrdom in the cause of love. As soon as

Alceste became a surrogate for Queen Anne, her story lost all its force. No matter how faithful and devoted the queen was in her character of young and loving wife, she had never achieved the martyr's crown, nor is there any likelihood that she aspired to it.

But this is not all. Gower's vision of Venus and Cupid, in the eighth book of the *Confessio Amantis*, reminds one forcibly of the Prologue to Chaucer's *Legend*. The question of indebtedness need not here be raised,[1] but one thing may be asserted without fear of contradiction: Gower must have recollected the Prologue when he was writing the vision. Not to speak of general resemblances, we have a "flower and leaf" passage, and a message from the Goddess of Love bidding Chaucer write a poem. Now among the others who were present at Love's court Gower saw four women —

> Whos name I herde most commended:
> Be hem the Court stod al amended;
> For wher thei comen in presence,
> Men deden hem the reverence,
> As thogh they hadden be goddesses,
> Of all this world or emperesses.
> —viii, 2607 ff.

These, he heard, were "the foure wyves whos feith was proeved in her lyves." They were Penelope, Lucrece, Alceste, and Alcyone.

> Lo, these foure were tho
> Whiche I sih, as me thoghte tho,
> Among the grete compaignie
> Which Love hadde for to guye.
> —viii, 2657 ff.

Alceste, it will be noticed, is the third in order. Gower has already told her story at greater length in the seventh book.[2] In neither place does he mention her restoration to life.

It is quite certain that, if Chaucer's Alceste had been meant for the queen or had been so understood by the court of Richard II, Gower would have been aware of it. He was a court poet, too, and the *Confessio* was written by royal command. His

[1] See M. Bech, *Das Verhältniss der "Confessio Amantis" zur Legende of Goode Women* (*Anglia*, V, 365 ff.).

[2] vii, 1917 ff.

introduction of Alceste in this place is certainly reminiscent of Chaucer's *Legend*. Yet it is perfectly clear that Gower's Alceste is simply herself, with no ulterior allegorical significance. This might count for little, perhaps, under ordinary circumstances, but the circumstances are by no means ordinary. Several of the heroines of Chaucer's *Legend* are present, Troilus and Criseide are there,[1] the story of Cleopatra's being torn to pieces in a pit of serpents is mentioned,[2] and finally Gower receives a mandate which he is to deliver to Chaucer, Venus' "disciple and poet."[3] I think we have good reason to infer that if Chaucer meant Alceste for Queen Anne, none of his contemporaries recognized the intention. And I do not wonder.

G. L. KITTREDGE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

[1] viii, 2531. [2] viii, 2571 ff. [3] viii, 2941* ff.

CONCERNING FITZHERBERT'S BOOK OF HUSBANDRY

In an article in a recent number of *Modern Philology*,[1] W. H. Hulme assumes in no uncertain tones that the long description of a good horse in Fitzherbert's *Book of Husbandry* "is derived with considerable additions and modifications" from one of two similar descriptions in English, represented respectively by a Lansdowne and Cotton manuscript of the British Museum. The similarity lies in the comparison of the characteristics of a horse with those of other animals and a woman. The shorter version found in the manuscripts is not confined to England, as Mr. Hulme seems to assume. Reinhold Köhler has pointed out early French, German, and Dutch analogues of the Lansdowne version, which was known to him.[2] If this peculiar type of literature is widely spread, it can hardly be called popular, or an "interesting bit of farriers' lore" as Mr. Hulme puts it, as it was evidently suggested by a better-known intellectual *tour de force*, the description of the beauties of a woman, of which Köhler has collected a large number of examples.[3]

The description in the *Book of Husbandry* is so amplified with its fifty-four qualities of a horse for comparison, against the eighteen to be found in the next largest list in a Dutch composition, that one must regard this elaborate scheme as an attempt of Fitzherbert, or of his immediate authority, to include in this fanciful comparison every good characteristic of a horse noted in veterinary handbooks. In the chapter, "De cognitione pulcritudinis corporis equi," in *De medicina equorum* of Jordanus Ruffus, the allusions to characteristics in other animals are slight and adventitious,[4] and the translators of the work into Italian, French, and Provençal followed their Latin text closely.[5] Perhaps an examination of later veterinary works will show the beginning of the tendency, which in Fitzherbert's book subordinates the whole subject to the desire of making whimsical classifications, a thing which would be incongruous in a technical work.

GEORGE L. HAMILTON

[1] Vol. VI, 129–32. [2] *Kleinere Schriften*, III, 33.

[3] *Ibid.*, 22 ff., 418; cf. F. Liebrecht, *Germania*, XXXIII, 251; *Le débat des hérauts d'armes*, ed. Pannier and Meyer, 3, 129.

[4] Chap. iv, *Jordani Ruffi calabriensis Hippiatria*, ed. J. Molin, Patavia, 1818.

[5] G. de Gregorio, *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, XXIX, 566, 575; *Romania*, XXXIII, 375; Meyer, *Rom.*, XXIII, 351, 356, 357.

STUDIES IN GERMANIC STRONG VERBS. III

55. Kwīnan

Norw. dial. *kvīna* 'be sharp or pungent (of taste or smell),' also 'be crowded, swarm' (Aasen, *Ordbog* 410; Ross, *Ordbog* 454) probably represents an ON. **kuína* 'crowd, press; be pungent.' Compare ON. *kuí* 'fold, pen,' *kuía* 'pen, hem in,' Gk. *ἀ-δινός* 'crowded, close-packed; vehement, loud; severe (bite), etc.' (cf. Zupitza, *Gutturale* 88), and Skt. *jināti* 'überwältigt, unterdrückt,' Gk. *βιάζω* 'overpower,' ON. *kueita* 'overpower,' Icel. *kveisa* 'gripes, colic,' etc. (cf. *MLN.* XVI, 26 f.; XXII, 236).

56. Snīkan

OE. *snīcan* 'creep, crawl,' ME. *sniken* (st. or wk.?), Dan. *snige* 'schleichen,' Sw. dial. *sniga* (*snēg*, *snigit*, and wk. Rietz *Dialekt-lexikon* 642) 'smyga,' *snika* (*snājk*, *sneke*, and wk. Linder, *Om Allmogemålet i Södra Möre Härad* 24), perhaps here Norw. dial. adj. (pp.?) *sniken* 'fugtig og kjölig (om vind),' 'damp and cool.'—These are from a base *sneig-*, also in NE. *sneak* 'schleichen,' Sw. dial. *sneg* 'listig; umsichtig,' Norw. dial. *snīk* 'secrecy,' and probably in Lat. *nictere* 'schnuppern, schnüffeln.'

With *sneig-* compare *snēg-:* ON. *snákr*, *snókr*, OE. *snaca* 'snake,' OHG. *snahhan* 'kriechen, schleichen,' ON. *snaka*, Sw. *snoka* 'schnüffeln, stöbern,' Norw. dial. *snōka* 'snuse, speide, snage, rapse, snylte; lufte, blæse svagt men lidt kjøligt,' 'snuff, pry about, sponge; puff, blow cool,' etc. (*snōb-:* ON. *snópa* 'hang about,' Norw. dial. *snōpa* 'snylte, snage, luske til sig, rapse, snige,' 'sponge, pilfer,' *snōpen* 'snyltende, snagende, nærig, lækkermundet,' NE. *snoop* 'go about in a prying or sneaking way,' E. Fries. *snōpen* 'naschen,' Du. *snoepen* 'schnopern,' cf. *MLN.* XXII, 236). Compare the following.

57. Snīkjan

Norw. dial. *snīkja* (*sneik*, *snikji*, and wk.) 'snylte, snige sig frem for at faa noget; skaffe sig noget ved at snylte eller trygle,'

'sponge, beg,' Sw. dial. *snīka* (*snēk*, *snikit*, and wk.) 'be greedy for, sponge':—ON. *snīkia* wk. 'beg, sponge,' *snīkenn* 'greedy,' etc. These, with OE. *snīcan* etc. (no. 56), are compared with Lett. *snēgt* 'reichen, langen,' *snēgtēs* 'wonach langen, sich strecken; streben' (cf. Falk og Torp, *Et. Ordbog* II, 247).

For the base *sneig-* we may assume the primary meaning 'bend, twist: draw together, draw in,' whence 'sneak, snoop' and 'cling to, press upon, urge, beg, etc.' From 'draw in, shrink' comes Lett. *snaigs* 'schlank,' with which compare Norw. dial. *sniken* 'damp and cool,' i. e., 'sharp, biting.' Similarly from *snēg-*, *snōg-*, 'draw together, etc.' come Norw. dial. *snæk* 'bidsk, bitter,' *snækja* 'blæse koldt,' 'blow cold,' *snøkja* 'be keen, sharp (of edged tools and of a cool, damp breeze).' For meaning compare OHG. *snerfan* 'zusammenziehen,' Norw. *snerpa* 'draw together, shrivel; wrinkle,' Sw. dial. *snärpa* 'snörpa; vara snål, girig,' 'draw or sew loosely together; draw to oneself, be greedy,' ON. *snarpr* 'streng, scharf,' etc.

58. SNĪÞAN

Goth. *sneiþan* 'schneiden, ernten,' etc. probably do not come from *sqneit-* 'cut' (so Johansson, *PBB.* XIV, 354f.), but from *sneit-* 'turn, twist: jerk, snap, snatch, clip.' That 'twist' was the primary meaning seems probable from the following: ON. *snīða* '(ab)-schneiden, hauen; vorbeigleiten,' Norw. dial. *snīda* 'skjære, afskjære; vende til siden, gaa i skraa retning,' 'cut, cut off; turn aside, go slanting,' ON., NIcel. *sneiða* 'cut into slices; taunt; walk zigzag,' Norw. dial. *sneida* 'svinge, dreie til siden; slaa eller hugge til siden; snappe efter noget; stikle paa en,' 'swing, turn aside, dash aside; snatch at; snap at (a person),' *snida* 'sætte skjevt; vride paa, dreie paa (især om tale),' 'make crooked, distort,' *snidug* 'smidig, bøielig i lemmerne; snedig, listig,' 'lithe, limber; wily, sly,' Sw. *sned* 'schief, schräg,' Dan. *snedig* 'listig, schlau, verschlagen,' MLG. *snēdich*, *sneidich* 'listig, schlau, gewandt,' NHG. *schneidig*.

Such meanings as 'lithe, limber; sly, wily,' can hardly come from 'cut.' It is true that we might have 'cut, separate, turn aside,' but not 'lithe, limber.' The base *sneit-* 'turn, twist; snap, snatch,

clip' may come from *snĕi-*. Compare Norw. dial. *snīpa* 'snatch, filch,' MHG. *snipfen* 'schnappen,' Du. *snippen*, NE. *snip* 'cut off with a quick stroke,' from *snēib-* (*snēb(h)-*: Norw. dial, *snaapa* 'hasten,' *snava* 'pry around, filch,' NHG. *schnappen*, NE. *snap*, etc.); NE. *snick* 'snip, clip,' Du. dial. *snikken* 'knippen,' Norw. dial. '*snikka* skjære med eet snit.'

59. DRĪFAN

For ON. *þrífa* 'grasp, seize,' refl. 'thrive,' etc. I have assumed the primary meaning 'press,' whence 'grasp' and 'be compact' in the above; 'tread' in Lith. *trypiù* 'trete, stampfe;' and 'press, rub' in Lett. *trẽpju* 'beschmiere' (cf. *MLN.* XVIII, 16; *IE.* a^x: a^xi: a^xu 62). I now find the meaning 'press' in the strong verb NWest Fries. *trîû* (Siebs in Paul's *Grundriss*[2] 1309), *triuwe* (Feitsma, *De Vlugge Fries* 84) 'drücken.' This probably represents OFries. **thrīva*, which would exactly correspond to the strong verb in ON., etc.

60. ŪJAN

Norw. dial. *ȳ* (pret. *au*, *öu*, also wk. Ross, *Ordbog* 922) 'vrimle,' 'swarm, teem':—ON., Icel. *úa* 'swarm, teem,' *úi* 'swarm, crowd,' Norw. dial. *aua* 'mylre, vrimle,' 'swarm, teem.' Perhaps 'roll, crawl, creep,' is the original meaning here. Compare Norw. dial. *aula* 'krybe; mylre,' 'kriechen; wimmeln,' *ula ylja*, *uldra*, *yldra*, *ulma* 'mylre, vrimle' with Gk. εὐλή 'worm, maggot,' ἕλμις 'tapeworm,' Skt. *válati* 'wendet sich, dreht sich,' etc.; Norw. dial. *aura øyra*, *urja*, *yrja* 'mylre, vrimle': Goth. *waurms* 'Wurm,' Lat. *vermis*, Gk. ῥόμος 'wood-worm,' with which compare Du. *wremelen*, *wriemelen*, Dan. *vrimle* 'wimmeln;' Norw, dial. *vama*, *vaama*, *vamla*, *vamra* 'gaa tumlende, gaa i ørsken,' 'be dizzy, stagger': OHG. *wamezzen*, *wimezzen*, MHG. *wimmen*, *wimelen* 'sich regen, wimmeln,' OHG. *wiuman* 'wimmeln' (cf. Falk og Torp, *Ordbog* II, 446); Westf. *wibbeln* 'wimmeln': EFries. *wibbeln*, *wabbeln* 'sich hin und her bewegen,' OHG. *wabelen* 'in geschäftiger Bewegung sein,' MHG. *webelen* 'schwanken,' OE. *wafian* 'wave,' etc.

61. URJAN

Norw. dial. *yrja* (pret. *aur*, *öur*, also wk. Ross, *Ordbog* 924) 'vrimle,' 'wimmeln':—Norw. dial. *urja*, *aura*, *øyra*, 'wimmeln,' *yrja*, *urja*, *aur* 'Gewimmel.' Probably related as given in no. 60 above. Or, if the primary meaning was 'scatter, pour out,' as in Norw. *ysja* 'mylre frem, drysse frem (om bitte smaa dyr),' 'swarm out, scatter out,' *usla* 'fyge (om støv, snee),' 'stieben,' ON. *usle* 'ashes,' we may compare *yrja* 'wimmeln' with Norw. dial. *ȳra* 'fall as dew or fine rain,' Sw. *yra* 'stöbern, wirbeln, fliegen, spritzen,' ON., Icel. *ýra* 'let fall in small drops, strew, sprinkle; drizzle,' ON., *úr* 'drizzle; sparks,' *ver* 'sea,' Skt. *vār(i)* 'Wasser,' etc.

62. DYKA

Sw. dial. *dyka* (pret. *dök*, *dōk*, sup. *dyki* or *dykt*) 'springa fort; hålla ovāsen, kifva, träta på ett stormande sätt, skoja och svära; hastigt anfalla, rusa på,' 'rush along, storm, scold; attack, abuse':—Sw. dial. *dukå* 'bullra, larma,' 'poltern, rasen,' early Dan. *dyge* 'løbe, skynde sig': MHG. *tocken* 'Flatterhaftigkeit,' *tucken*, *tücken* 'eine schnelle Bewegung machen, bes. nach unten, sich beugen, neigen,' *tūchen* 'tauchen,' etc., Av. *ðwōžən* 'sie flattern,' Skt. *dhvajá-s*, *-m* 'Fahne,' ON. *dúkr* 'Tuch,' etc. (cf. *IE.* a^x*:* $a^x i$*:* $a^x u$ 74 f.). Cf. Uhlenbeck, *Ai. Wb.* 139.

63. HŪFAN

Norw. dial. adj. (pp. ?) *hoven* 'hoven, opsvulmet,' Dan. *hoven* 'geschwollen, aufgedunsen, dick; aufgeblasen' (not the same as Norw. dial. *hoven* 'hævet, opløftet,' pp. of *hevja* 'heben'):—Norw. dial. *hovna*, Dan. *hovne* 'schwellen, an- aufschwellen, sich ausdehnen, etc.,' may be compared with Skt. *çōpha-s* 'Geschwulst, Geschwür, Beule' and Lith. *szupù*, *szupti* 'faul, morsch werden (von Holz),' base *k̂eu̯eph-* from *k̂eu̯e-* in Skt. *çváyati* 'schwillt an,' etc., whence also *k̂eu̯eb-* in NIcel. *hvap* 'dropsical flesh,' Norw. dial. *kvap* 'en blød el. fugtig masse,' *kvapen* 'blød, fugtig, vædskefuld; opsvulmet, aaben, gabende (om saar);' *k̂eu̯es-* in Norw. dial. (pp. ?) *hosen* 'spongy, porous; dropsical,' *hosna* 'become spongy, bloat,' Gk. *κύστις* 'bladder, bag,' *κύστη· ἄρτος σπογγίτης*, Skt.

çávas 'Stärke, Übermacht,' etc. Here also belong OE. *hwelian* 'suppurate; make to suppurate,' Lith. *szvelnùs* 'weich, sanft anzufassen,' Lat. *colostra* 'beestings' (*Class. Phil.* III, 81), and Lith. *szulnas* 'stattlich, vortrefflich,' *szaũnas* 'tüchtig, brav,' with which compare Skt. *çúra-s* 'stark, tapfer.' For other related words see Walde, *Lat. Et. Wb.* 108 f.

64. LŪAN

An adj. in the form of a pp. of the above is found in ON., NIcel. *lúinn* 'worn out, exhausted,' Norw. dial. *lūen* 'udmattet, døsig, sløv,' 'exhausted, stupid,' OSw. *lūin* 'ohnmächtig.' Nearest related are Norw. dial. *lu* 'exhausted,' ON., NIcel. *lúi* 'weariness, exhaustion,' NIcel. *lýja* 'tire, fatigue,' *lýjast* 'become tired, exhausted,' ON. *lýia* 'entkräften, erschöpfen' (probably not the same as *lýia* 'schlagen, zerquetschen').

These words are usually referred to Skt. *lunáti* 'schneidet, schneidet ab,' etc. But in meaning they are better combined with Lith. *liauti* 'aufhören,' Pruss. *aulāut* 'sterben,' Czech *leviti* 'nachlassen,' Lett. *ljaut* 'zulassen, erlauben,' Goth, *lēwjan* 'verraten,' etc. Here also I should put Gk. λύω 'loose,' Lat. *luo*, separating them from Skt. *lunáti* 'schneidet.'

The base *lēu-* of the above is also in the following: ON. *lauss* 'frei, lose, verfallen, nicht mehr gültig, schwach,' Goth. *fraliusan* 'verlieren,' etc.—ON. *lúta* 'sich beugen; nachgeben' (:Czech *leviti* 'nachlassen'), Goth. *lutōn* 'betrügen' (: *lēwjan* 'verraten'), Welsh *lludded* 'Müdigkeit' (: ON. *lúi* 'weariness'), Lith. *liũdnas* 'traurig,' etc.—MLG. *lūren* 'lauern; betrügen,' ON. *lúra* 'doze, nap,' Norw. dial. *lūra* 'hang the head; doze,' *lūr*, *lūren* 'mat, døsig,' 'tired,' OE. *lēoran* 'depart, pass away; die.'—Norw. dial. *lūv* 'with bowed head,' *lūva* 'bow, bend, crouch, bend down the head,' with which compare MDu. *ghelōve*, Du. *loof* 'matt, erschöpft,' Gk. λῡπέω 'grieve,' pass. 'mourn' (cf. Uhlenbeck, *PBB.* XXVI, 570).—Gk. λῡγίζω 'bend, twist,' ON. *lykna* 'bend the knees,' Norw. dial. *lỹkja* 'bøie sig sammen,' *loken* 'udmattet, sløv af anstrengelse,' MHG. *sich lūchen* 'sich zurückziehen, ducken,' Lat. *lūgeo* 'mourn,' etc.

65. NEUTAN

Goth. *niutan* 'erlangen, geniessen,' *ganiutan* 'fangen,' etc. have been compared with Lith. *naudà* 'Nutzen, Habe,' *naũdyju* 'begehre,' and also with Skt. *nudáti* 'stösst, drängt, treibt an, vertreibt' (cf. J. Schmidt, *Voc.* I, 156; Meringer, *IF.* XVIII, 235).

This is not the usually accepted explanation but is probably the correct one, though not in just the way Meringer takes it. For the base *neud-* we may therefore assume the primary meaning 'chase, drive,' whence 'catch, gain, enjoy.' This may go back to a primitive base *neu-* in Skt. *návatē*, *nāuti* 'bewegt sich, wendet sich,' *nāvayati* 'bewegt vom Platze, wendet.'

Here also may belong OHG. *niot* 'dringendes lebhaftes Verlangen, eifriges Streben,' OS. *niud* 'Verlangen,' OE. *nēod* 'desire, zeal, earnestness, pleasure.' These go back to pre-Germ. **neutó-* or **neudho-*. In the latter case they may be compared directly with Lith. *naũdyju* 'begehre.'

66. NYTA

Sw. dial. *nyta* 'våga, töras,' 'dare' (pret. *nōt*, sup. *nōte*, and wk. Linder 25, 117).—This is an originally weak verb probably related to the above. Compare Sw. dial. *nyter* 'förnöjd, glad, treflig; angelägen, begärlig,' 'cheerful, friendly; eager,' ON. *nýtr* 'nützlich; trefflich, herrlich,' NIcel. *nýtur* 'fit, able,' and the words given under no. 65.

67. SMȲTA

Norw. dial. *smȳta* (*smaut*, *smote*, and wk., Aasen, *Ordbog* 714, Ross, *Ordbog* 719) 'liste bort, före i skjul,' 'slip or sneak anything away' is from a base *směud-*, parallel in the development of its meanings with *směid-* in no. 11 above, Vol. IV, 496 f. Compare the following: Norw. dial. *smȳta*, *smøyta*, 'liste (bort, frem),' Dan. *smutte* 'schlüpfen': Sw. *smīta* 'schleichen, sich drücken'; Norw. dial. *smøytast* 'kysses, kjæle med hinanden,' 'caress each other,' MLG. *smotteren* 'schmeicheln, liebkosen,' Norw. dial. *smuta*, MHG. *smutzen* 'schmunzeln': Norw. dial. *smiten* 'einschmeichelnd,' Lett. *smaidīt* 'schmeicheln,' *smaida* 'Lächeln;' MHG. *smutzen* 'streichen, schlagen; beflecken': *smīzen* 'streichen, schlagen,' OHG. *bismīzan* 'beschmeissen, beflecken.'

68. DRŪAN

OE. pp. *geþrūen* 'verdichtet' (written also twice *geþuren* Sievers, *Gram.*[3], §385, Anm. 1) is probably from the base, *trū-*, *treu-* 'press, compress; rub' in ChSl. *tryti* 'reiben,' Gk. *τρύω* 'distress, afflict, vex,' OE. *þrēan* 'oppress, afflict; punish; threaten;' Lat. *trūdo* 'press, crowd,' OE. *þrēatian* 'urge on, press; afflict; threaten,' etc. For meaning compare no. 52 above, Vol. V, p. 288.

69. DELPA

Sw. dial. *dälpa* (*dalp, dulpi*), *dölpa* (*dalp, dulpet*) 'omstjelpa, hvälfva, vända up och ned,' 'overturn, turn over' (Rietz, *Svenskt Dialekt-lexikon* 112), related to the weak verbs Sw. dial. *dulpa, dylpa* 'dive,' *dölpa* 'dive under water,' and to *dulpa* 'holes, ruts in the road,' *dälpig* 'full of ruts,' Norw. dial. *dolp, dølp* 'hollow in the ground,' *dulp* 'a little wet hollow,' *dulpa* 'dive; pulsate,' *dylpa* 'hop; duck (the head) up and down (esp. of fowls),' base *dhelb-*, with which compare Lith. *nu-delbiù, -dilpstù* 'schlage die Augen nieder, glupe,' *dìlba* 'Gluper.' This is probably from *dhel-, dhol-* in Gk. *θόλος* 'dome, vault,' ChSl. *dolŭ* 'Loch, Grube,' Goth. *dal* 'Tal, Vertiefung, Grube,' ON. *dala* 'dent; be hollowed out,' Sw. *dala*, 'sinken,' etc., whence also *dhelbh-* 'hollow out, dig' in OE. *delfan* 'dig, burrow,' Russ. *dolbíti* 'aushöhlen, meisseln,' etc., with which Brugmann, *Grundriss* I[2], 472 compares Lith. *nu-dilpstù*.

70. DRELLA

Sw. dial. *drälla*, (*drall, drullit* Rietz, *Svenskt Dialekt-lexikon* 101) 'fall down, collapse; go to pieces; loiter, be slow' is perhaps an originally strong verb of which the causative is Sw. dial. *drälla* (*drallde*, but also *drall*) 'let fall carelessly, spill, waste,' related to *drallta, drällta* 'spill,' Norw. dial. *dralla* (*drala?*) 'shuffle along, loiter,' *dralta* 'saunter, be slow,' NIcel. *drolla* 'loiter, dally.' If *-ll-* is from *-zl-*, we may compare ON. *drasenn* 'träge, faul,' *dras-* 'Gewäsch,' OE. *drōs* 'dregs, dirt,' OHG. *truosana* 'Hefe, Drusen, Bodensatz,' *trestir* 'Treber,' OE. *dærst* 'leaven,' pl. 'dregs.' These come from a base *dhres-* 'drop, droop,' with which compare *dhreus-* in OE. *drēosan* 'fall,' *drūsian* 'become languid, sluggish,' etc. For synonymous bases *dhrex-, dhreux-*, see *IE.* a^x*:* $a^x i$*:* $a^x u$ 76 f.

71. DRINGAN

Sw. dial. adj. (pp. ?) *drungen* 'fuktig, våt (om sank och sur jord),' 'moist, wet' may be compared with Norw. dial. *dragen* 'fugtig,' 'moist, damp,' and with NIcel. *drungi* 'drowsiness, gloominess.' Outside of Germ. we may compare Lith. *drė̃gnas* 'feucht,' *drėkinù* 'mache feucht,' *drignis* 'blöde' (vom Auge), and *drangùs*, *druñgnas* 'lauwarm.' For meaning compare OHG. *welk* 'feucht, milde, lau, welk.' To the same group may also belong Goth. *drigkan* 'drink,' etc. (cf. *MLN.* XVIII, 15 f.).

72. GERDAN

Goth. *bigairdan* 'umgürten,' *ufgairdan* 'aufschürzen':—Goth. *gairda*, OHG. *gurtil* 'Gürtel,' *gurten* 'gürten,' etc. These are well compared with Goth. *gards* 'Haus,' ON. *garðr* 'Zaun, eingehegter Hof,' etc., Lith. *žarãdis* 'Hürde,' Pruss. *sardis* 'Zaun,' and with Gk. *κορθέλαι· συστροφαί. σωροί, κορθέλας καὶ κόρθιν· τοὺς σωρούς. καὶ τὴν συστροφήν* (Fick, *BB.* XVII, 321 f.). To these I add Av. *zrādō* 'Kettenpanzer,' NPers. *zirih* 'Panzer,' which, with this explanation, are to be separated from Skt. *hrādatē* 'tönt.' The base *ĝheredh-* of the above is from *ĝhere-* 'zusammen-, um-, einfassen' (cf. Walde, *Lat. Et. Wb.* 130 f.).

73. GLEKKA

Norw. dial. *glekka* (pret. *glakk*) 'be startled' is used like *klekka*, *kløkka* 'fare sammen, bli bevæget,' to which it is probably a rime-word. It may be referred to a Germ. base *glink-* 'make a sudden movement, recoil; swing, dangle' in Norw. dial. *glekk* 'frastödende, uhyggeligt udseende,' 'repulsive,' MHG. *glanken*, *glunkern* 'baumeln,' *glunke* 'baumelnde Locke.' Compare *glimp-*, *glepp-* in Norw. *gleppa* 'glide ud, komme af lave, rokkes af stedet; glippe,' 'slip, totter, etc.'

74. KRILLA, KRELLA

Sw. dial. *krilla*, *krälla* (*krall*, *krullit*, *krulliđ*) 'creep, crawl':—Dan. *krille* 'kribbeln, jucken, krabbeln, kitzeln,' Sw. dial. *kralla* 'creep on hands and feet, crawl; tickle, etc.,' MHG. *krellen* 'kratzen,' *kral* 'gekrallte Wunde, Kratz,' NHG. *Kralle*. These

may have *-ll-* from *-zl-*. Compare OHG. *kresan* 'kriechen,' base *gres-* 'draw together, crook, crawl.' This may be identical with the base *grĕs-* in Gk. *γράω* 'gnaw, eat,' Skt. *grásati* 'verschlingt, frisst, verzehrt,' *grāsa-s* 'Mundvoll, Bissen, Futter,' ON. *krás* 'Leckerbissen.' For meaning compare MHG. *krimmen* 'mit gekrümmten Klauen oder Fingern packen, verwunden, kratzen, reissen; refl. sich winden, krümmen, kriechen' (cf. *IE.* a^x: a^xi: a^xu 103 f.).

75. SKVELLA

Norw. dial. *skvella* (pret. *skvall*, etc.) 'swell' looks like a blend of Germ. *kwellan* 'gush out; swell' and *swellan* 'swell.' But it is quite possible that 'swell' developed from 'gush out, overflow, abundare' as in *kwellan*. Compare Dan. *skvale* 'plätschern, sprudeln, hervorquellen,' Sw. *skvala* 'fliessen, strömen,' Norw. dial. *skvala* 'splash, gush out,' etc. Compare the following.

76. SKVELPA

Norw. dial. *skvelpa* (*skvalp*, etc.) 'splash,' Sw. dial. *skvilpa* (*skvalp*) 'splash':—OSw. *skwalpa* 'plätschern,' Sw. *skvalpa* 'plätschern, schwappen,' Dan. *skvalpe* 'schütteln; wanken, schwanken,' *skulpe* 'schütteln,' MLG. *schulpen* 'eine Flüssigkeit stark hin und her bewegen, dass sie überzufliessen droht,' etc., base sq^ua^xlb- in Lith. *skalbiù* 'wasche schlagend, bläue,' from sq^ua^xl- in Lith. *skaláuti* 'vom Wasser fortgesetzt heftig anschlagend waschen, spülen; durch fortges. Schütteln ausspülen,' Dan. *skval* 'Plätschern, Wellenschlag,' *skvale* 'plätschern, sprudeln, hervorquellen,' ON. *skola* 'abwaschen,' MLG. *scholen* 'strömen, Wellen schlagen; spülen, eine Flüssigkeit hin und her bewegen, im Wasser hin und her schwenken,' etc. (cf. Zupitza, *Gutturale* 47; Falk og Torp, *Ordbog* II, 211, 213).

Since the primary meaning of these words seems to be 'shake, move to and fro,' we may compare Skt. *skhálati* 'wankt, taumelt, stolpert, geht fehl,' Arm. *sxalem* 'wanke, strauchele, gehe fehl,' Gk. *σφάλλω* 'throw down, overthrow; make to totter.' These are better separated from Lat. *scelus* etc., on which see Walde, *Lat. Et. Wb.* 205, 551.

77. SLEKWAN

Germ. **slekwan* 'be extinguished,' with *-u̯o-* suffix in pres., has pp. ON. *slokenn*, Norw. dial. *slokjen*, OSw. *slukin*, Sw. dial. *sloken* 'erloschen,' of the fourth series. As the *w* caused gemination, we find the *-kk-* generalized, thus throwing the verb into the third class, in Norw. dial. *sløkka* 'be extinguished, cease to burn,' pret. *slokk*, sup. *slokket*, pp. *slokken*, Sw. dial. pret. *slökk*, pp. *slokken*. The causative also has *-kk-:* ON. *sløkkua* 'löschen,' OSw. *sløkkia*, *slækkia*, whence Sw. Dial. *släkka* 'slake, extinguish,' pret. *slakk*, sup. *slukki*, and weak.

To the same base belong ON. *slakr* 'schlaff,' OE. *slæc* 'slack, slothful, languid,' OS. *slac*, OHG. *slah*, etc., with which have been compared Gk. λήγω 'appease, stay; cease, end,' λαγγάζω 'loiter, slacken, give up,' Lat. *langueo*, etc. (cf. Walde, *Et. Wb.* 323 f. with lit.). To these add ON. *slókr* 'Herumschlenderer,' *slǫkinn* 'träge, indolent,' Norw. dial. *slōken* 'slap og slunken,' *slōk* 'tung slap og slusket person,' 'untidy person,' Sw. *slōka* 'schlaff hangen,' Lith. *slogus* 'beschwerlich,' *slogà* 'Plage,' *slĕgiu* 'bedrücke, presse,' Lett. *slēdzu* 'schliesse,' and also OE. *slincan* 'creep, slink,' etc., MDu. *slanc* 'mager, afgevallen, slap,' Dan. *slunken* 'schlaff,' etc. (cf. *AJP.* XXIV, 42).

78. STELPAN

OSw. *stiœlpa* 'umfallen' (also wk. in MSw.), Sw. dial. *stjelpa*, *stälpa*, pret. *stalp*, etc. (but lit. Sw. *stjälpa* 'umfallen, umstürzen' wk.), NWFries. *stjalpe:*—OSw. *stiœlpa* (**stalpjan*) 'umwälzen,' Sw. *stjälpa* 'umwerfen, umkippen,' ON. *stelpa*, MLG. *stulpen* 'umstürzen,' MDu. (Kilian) *stelpen*, *stulpen* 'sistere, stipare, obturare, obstruere, occulere, restringere, inhibere,' Norw. dial. *stelpa* 'hemmen, hindern,' *stolpa* 'gaa med stive skridt, stolpre,' 'walk with stiff legs, stumble,' *stolpeleg* 'stiff and clumsy,' *stolputt* 'stiff and stumbling,' Dan. *stolpre*, NHG. *stolpern* (a LG. word), ON., Sw., Dan. *stolpe*, MLG. *stolpe* 'Pfosten, Pfahl,' Lett. *stulbs*, ChSl. *stlŭba* 'Treppe,' etc., base *sthelb-* 'come to a stand, stop, stumble; bring to a stand, stop, check, cause to stumble, etc.; cause to stand, set up, etc.,' from *sthel-:* Skt. *sthálati* 'steht,' etc. (cf. ten Doornkaat Koolman, *Ostfries. Wb.* III, 352; Falk og

Torp, *Ordbog* II, 302). With *sthelb-* of the above compare *sthlemb-* in Lat. *stlembus* 'slow and clumsy in gait.'

79. TESSA

Norw. dial. *tessa* impers. (pret. *tass*, *toss*, sup. *tossi*, *tessi* Ross, *Ordbog* 813) 'rasle eller klukke, om luften i et legeme som presses sammen ved slag, stød eller fald,' 'gurgle': Norw. dial. *tasa*, *taasa* 'rattle, rustle,' *tiska* 'rustle,' *tisla* 'hiss, whisper,' Sw. *tissla* 'flüstern,' Sw. dial. *tessa*, *tissa*, 'lächeln,' MHG. *zesse* 'brausende Woge, Unwetter,' OHG. *zessa*, *zessōd*, 'Brausen der Wogen,' *zessōn* 'brausen, sich brausend bewegen (v. Wasser).'

A synonymous Germ. *tīs-* occurs in ON., NIcel. *tíst* 'squeak; twitter,' *tísta* 'squeak; twitter, chirp,' to which may belong Norw. *tiska*, *tisla*, etc., and NHG. *zischen*, *zischeln*, MHG. *zispezen* 'Zischen,' NHG. *zirpen*. Compare also *tus-* in Norw. dial. *tusa* 'frembringe sagte lyd; tale sagte, hviske,' 'crackle; whisper,' *tuska* 'rattle,' *tusla*, 'whisper,' NE. *tush*, an exclamation of surprise or contempt, MLG. *tus* interj. um Stille zu gebieten, *tussent* 'sibilus,' NHG. *tusch*, *tuschen*, *tuscheln*.

Some of the above words are no doubt onomatopoetic, formed as rime-words to others. But the original stock from which the first group came may go back to the IE. root *dĕ-*, *dĕi* in Gk. δονέω 'shake, stir,' ἀλί-δονος 'sea-tossed,' δῑνέω 'whirl, turn, spin round,' δίνη, δῖνος 'vortex, whirlpool, eddy,' δίεμαι 'hasten,' Skt. *dīyati* 'schwebt, fliegt,' Lett. *de'iju* 'tanze,' etc. For other related words see *IE.* a^x*:* $a^x i$*:* $a^x u$ 65 f.

80. TWINGAN

That a Germ. base *twing-*, *twang-* occurred by the side of *þwing* is made probable by the following: OE. *twengan* 'pinch, squeeze,' ME. *twengen* 'press tightly' give NE. *twinge*, with palatalized *g*, which would hardly result if the word were of Norse origin as late as the change from *þ* to *t*. Moreover, OE. *twengan* corresponds to OHG. *zwangan*, *zwengen* 'vellere, praestringere, remordere, kneifen, kneipen,' related to *zwangōn*, *-kōn* 'anreizen, inritare' (cf. Schade, *Wb.*² 1307).

As a strong verb the word is found in ME. *twingen* 'press, oppress,' 3d sing. *twinges* 'affligit,' Ps. 41, 10, pp. *twungen* Ps.

37, 9. From a Germ. **twingan* may also come Waldeck. *twiŋᵉn* 'zwingen,' Westf. *twingen* (: *twang* 'Zwang; Druck,' beside *dwingen* 'zwingen'). But these are ambiguous, for Germ. *þw-* also appears as *tw-* in these dialects. MHG. *zwingen* is likewise ambiguous. It probably represents both **þwingan* and **twingan*.

Germ. *twing-* may be compared with *twekk-* in OE. *twiccian* 'pluck, gather; twitch,' MHG., *zwicken*, 'zerren, zwicken, einklemmen, mit Nägeln befestigen,' *zwacken* 'zupfen, zerren,' EFries. *twikken* 'zwicken, kneifen, drücken, plagen, reissen, zupfen,' *twakken* 'zwacken,' and with OHG. *zocchōn* 'ziehen, zerren; reizen, locken; pflücken,' *zogōn* 'ziehen, zerren, reissen,' *ziohan*, Goth. *tiuhan* 'ziehen,' etc., base *deuk-*, *deu̯ek-*, *du̯enk-*, (cf. *IE.* a^x*:* $a^x i$*:* $a^x u$ 69).

81. VRELLA

Sw. dial. *vrälla* (pret. *vrall*, otherwise weak) 'rinna, framvälla, flyta; vrimla, krāla, trilla,' 'run out, overflow; crawl, swarm' may have *-ll-* from *-zl-*. In that case compare Skt. *várṣati* 'regnet,' *varṣá-* 'Regen, Regenzeit, Jahr,' Gk. *ἔρση*, *ἐέρση* 'dew,' Ir. *frass* 'Regenschauer.' Or *vrälla* may be a blend of Germ. *wellan* 'well, flow out' and Sw. dial. *ralla* 'trilla, rulla, ramla; falla nedåt, släpa utför, 'roll, slip down,' etc.

82. WRESKWAN

Goth. *gawrisqan* 'Frucht bringen,' ON., NIcel. *roskinn* 'ripe in years, advanced in years:'—ON. *roskna* 'heranwachsen,' *rǫsku-ask* 'aufwachsen, reifen (von Früchten und Menschen)'. These are supposed to be from **u̯redh-sqᵘo-:* Skt. *várdhatē* 'wächst, erwachst,' etc. They may rather be from **u̯res-qᵘo-* from **u̯eres-* 'swell, grow': OE. *wearr* 'callosity, wart,' *wrase* 'knot, lump,' Lat. *verrūca* 'wart, hump, mound,' Skt. *várṣma* 'Höhe, Spitze, Grösse, Körper,' etc., and OS. *wrisi*, OHG. *risi*, *riso* 'Riese,' Lith. *resnas* 'stark,' Lett. *resns* 'dick, dickleibig,' Skt. *vṛ́ṣā* 'stark, männlich : Mann, Hengst, Stier,' *vṛṣabhá-s* 'stark, tüchtig, männlich : Stier,' Lat. *verrēs* 'boar,' etc. (cf. Kluge, *Et. Wb.*, *s. v. Riese;* Brugmann, *Grundriss*² II, 264).

FRANCIS A. WOOD

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE COLLEGE ELEMENT IN HAMLET

The allusions to Shakespeare in the two Cambridge plays, the *Return from Parnassus* and the *Return from Parnassus or the Scourge of Simony*—plays which we shall designate as *P1* and *P2*—should be familiar to students of the Elizabethan drama, yet as the argument of this paper is based chiefly upon them, a brief review of these references to the dramatist is necessary.

In December, 1598, the scholars of St. John's College, Cambridge, produced the *Pilgrimage to Parnassus*, a purely academic piece, with allusions to the curriculum, with quotations and adaptations from the Latin poets, and, strikingly like our modern undergraduate productions, with hits on town celebrities, among whom we find Hobson, of Miltonic fame. That the *Pilgrimage* was favorably received, obtaining more than the ordinary success, is proved by the fact that it was followed by *P1* and *P2*. *P1* was produced during the holiday season of 1600–1 and *P2* the following year, some time between Christmas, 1601, and January 5, 1602.[1] In *P1* a principal character is the fool, Gullio, who

[1] Scholars are not agreed as to the date of the production of *P2*. Arber dates it "rather in the first days of January, 1602, than in the last six of December, 1601, probably on New Year's day, 1602, as we now reckon." See the introduction to Arber's reprint of *P2* (London, 1878); also Smeaton's edition of this play, *Temple Dramatists* (London, 1905), Introduction, xii, p. 121, n. Fleay, *Chronicle of the English Drama* (London, 1891), Vol. II, p. 354, misreading the Dominical letters (see *infra*) dates the production 1603. Wilhelm Luhr, in his Kiel dissertation, *Die drei Cambridger Spiele vom Parnass* (1900), gives a detailed discussion of this question of chronology, and dates the production 1603. As this would invalidate our argument, it is necessary to show wherein he is mistaken.

In *P2*, Act III, Scene 1, Immerito, examined before Sir Raderic, states that the Dominical letter for the year is C. While this answer is called correct, the page completes it by adding the letter D. Now D designated the portion of the year from March 25, through December 31, 1601; C, the period from January 1, 1602, through March 24, 1602. (All the dates here given are N. S.) Thus the complete answer was that the Dominical letters for the year, March 25, 1601, to March 24, 1602, were D C. In this same scene Immerito, when asked, "When is the new moone?" replies correctly, "The last quarter, the 5 day, at 2 of the clock, and 38 minutes in the morning." Luhr, who has made careful calculation, states that this answer fits January 5, 1602. For a last point, the nine allusions in the play to Christmas and the New Year season, further establish the time of production. There can be no doubt that Luhr is correct in stating that *P2* "ursprunglich für das Weihnachtsfest 1601-1602 bestimmt war."

P2 has practically two prologues, the first in prose, followed by 88 lines in couplets. In the prose prologue Momus says, "What is presented here, is an old musty show, that hath lain this twelvemonth in the bottom of a coal-house amongst brooms and old shoes, an invention that we are ashamed of, and therefore we have promised the copies to the chandlers to wrap his candles in" (Smeaton's ed., p. 4). From this statement Luhr evolves the

desires to pose as a man of parts, and has accordingly memorized from *Venus and Adonis* and *Romeo and Juliet* several lines which he recites with great gusto, declaring that he admires them so much that he will have "sweet Mr. Shakespeare's" picture in his study.[1] Ingenioso, the wit of the play, approves the poetry, but laughs at the gull who tries to appropriate the poet's verses. At Gullio's request Ingenioso composes some stanzas in the style of Chaucer ("Chaucer's vaine" is seen chiefly in the use of such forms as *yheried* or *slepen*), parodies the opening lines of the *Fairy Queen*, and imitates *Venus and Adonis*. This alone pleases Gullio. A few lines of the play should be quoted here.

Gullio. Let mee heare Mr. Shakspear's veyne.

Ingenioso. Faire Venus, queene of beutie and of love,
Thy red doth stayne the blushinge of the morne
Thy snowie necke shameth the milkwhite dove,
Thy presence doth this naked worlde adorne:
Gazing on thee all other nymphes I scorne.
When ere thou dyest slowe shine that Satterday,
Beutie and grace muste sleepe with thee for aye!

following theory: "Der zweite Teil der *Return from Parnassus* ohne Prosaprolog wurde vielleicht im Dezember 1601 für eine Aufführung am 1 Januar 1602 geschrieben. Umstände unbekannter Art verhinderten die Aufführung. Nach einem Jahr holte man das Lustspiel wieder hervor und fügte als Erklärung für Anspielungen auf ältere Ereignisse und zugleich als Entschuldigung für das Unterlassen einer Neubearbeitung den Prosaprolog hinzu. In dieser Form wurde die *Scourge of Simony* im Januar 1603 . . . . aufgeführt" (pp. 19, 20).

There are two good arguments against this assumption: (1) To interpret this jesting prologue, with its depreciation of the play, as anything but a humorous statement is to lose the whole spirit of the piece. (2) The author of the *Parnassus* plays shows unmistakably by his allusions to contemporary events a desire to bring his dramas "up to date." If, as Luhr contends, *P 2* was produced 1602–3, why did not the writer change the Dominical letters to correspond with that year, and thus give some point to Immerito's examination? Luhr answers this by asserting that instead of making the trifling changes in the text, the writer added a prose prologue to explain why his dates were not correct. Surely this is wide of the mark, for a man with wit enough to write *P 2* would have sense enough to revise it.

Luhr, following Ward (*A History of English Dramatic Literature to the Death of Queen Anne* [London, 1899], Vol. II, p. 633, n.), has yet another argument. In the Halliwell-Phillips MS of *P 2*, Momus says, in the prose prologue, "Is it not a pretty humour to stand hammering upon two schollers some foure yeare." These "two schollers" made their first appearance in the *Pilgrimage to Parnassus*, produced during the Christmas season 1598–99. Adding four years to this date, the production of *P 2* would seem to fall in 1602–3. But there is another way of interpreting the phrase "some foure yeare." The *Pilgrimage to Parnassus* was acted, as we have said, 1598–99, and it is not impossible that it was repeated in the holidays of 1599–1600. In any case, *P 1* was acted during the holidays of 1600–1, and if, as internal evidence shows, *P 2* was acted during the Christmas season, 1601–2, it would be the fourth holiday performance since the appearance of the two scholars. We therefore date the production of *P 2* some time between December 25, 1601, and January 5, 1602. Cf. F. E. Schelling's *Elizabethan Drama* (Boston, 1908), Vol. II, p. 489.

[1] Act III, scene 1. See *Parnassus*, *Three Elizabethan Comedies*, edited by W. D. Macray (Clarendon Press, 1886).

Gullio. Noe more! I am one that can judge accordinge to the proverbe, *bovem ex unguibus.* Ey marry, sir, these have some life in them! Let this duncified worlde esteeme of Spencer and Chaucer, I'le worshipp sweet Mr. Shakspeare, and to honour him will lay his *Venus and Adonis* under my pillowe, as wee reade of one (I doe not well remember his name, but I am sure he was a kinge) slept with Homer under his bed's heade.[1]

In *P2*, Ingenioso and Judicio "censure" the list of poets from whose writing John Bodenham drew the selections for his *Belvedere or the Garden of the Muses*, 1600, and come to the names of Ben Jonson and Shakespeare:

Ingenioso. Ben Jonson

Judicio. The wittiest fellow of a bricklayer in England.

Ingenioso. A mere empiric, one who gets what he hath by observation, and makes only nature privy to what he endites; so slow an inventor, that he were better betake himself to his old trade of bricklaying, a bold whoreson, as confident now in making of a book, as he was in times past in laying of a brick.

William Shakespeare

Judicio. Who loves Adonis love, or Lucrece' rape,
His sweeter verse contains heart-robbing life,
Could but a graver subject him content,
Without love's foolish lazy languishment.[2]

While the contrast to Jonson is such a marked one that the allusion to Shakespeare is unmistakable praise, it is rather disappointing to find *Venus and Adonis* alone mentioned; however, in Act IV, scene 3, when Burbage and Kemp are brought on the stage, the plays are lauded. The passage is as follows:

Burbage. Now, Will Kemp, if we can entertain these scholars at a low rate, it will be well, they have oftentimes a good conceit in a part.

Kemp. It's true indeed, honest Dick, but the slaves are somewhat proud, and besides, it is a good sport in a part to see them never speak in their walk, but at the end of the stage, just as though in walking with a fellow we should never speak but at a stile, a gate, or a ditch, where a man can go no further. I was once at a comedy in Cambridge, and there I saw a parasite make faces and mouths of all sorts of this fashion.

Burbage. A little teaching will mend these faults, and it may be besides they will be able to pen a part.

Kemp. Few of the University pen plays well, they smell too much of that writer Ovid, and that writer Metamorphosis, and talk too much of

[1] Act IV, scene 1.

[2] See Smea ton's ed., Act I, scene 2.

Proserpina and Juppiter. Why, here's our fellow Shakespeare puts them all down—ay, and Ben Jonson too. O that Ben Jonson is a pestilent fellow; he brought up Horace giving the poets a pill, but our fellow Shakespeare hath given him a purge that made him bewray his credit.

Burbage. It's a shrewd fellow indeed.

A few lines farther on, Burbage tells Philomusus, a student candidate for the stage, to act a little of *Richard III*, and immediately, as though reciting a *locus classicus*, Philomusus begins:

> Now is the winter of our discontent
> Made glorious summer by the sun of York.

The natural interpretation of these allusions to Shakespeare is that his poems and plays were in everyone's mouth, and that at Cambridge, at least, he was not only ranked far above Ben Jonson, but prized beyond every one of the contemporary dramatists. On the other hand, Mr. Macray, who discovered the MSS of the *Pilgrimage to Parnassus* and *P1*, and first printed these plays, believes that these references show indeed Shakespeare's popularity, "but it is popularity only with a certain class." "The notices in the third play (i. e., *P2*) seem (as Mr. Mullinger has remarked, in *University of Cambridge*, p. 524, note) "to convey the notion that Shakespeare is the favorite of the rude half-educated strolling players, as distinguished from the refined geniuses of the University. . . . . Certainly the popularity assigned to him is not of a sort to be desired, but the popularity itself is indisputable."[1] Such a conclusion is surely wide of the mark. In the fifth chapter of the tenth book of *Amelia*, Fielding introduces Colonel Bath praising Shakespeare.

That Shakespeare [cries the Colonel] was a fine fellow. He was a very pretty poet indeed. Was it not Shakespeare that wrote the play about Hotspur? You must remember these lines. I got them almost by heart at the play house; for I never missed the play whenever it was acted, if I was in town:

> By Heav'n it was an easy leap,
> To pluck bright honour into the full moon,
> Or drive into the bottomless deep.

[1] Macray's *Parnassus*, Preface, x. Sarrazin, *Thomas Kyd und sein Kreis* (Berlin, 1892), p. 88, finds in *P2*, Act V, scene 1, ll. 2-18, "eine deutliche Spitze gegen Shakespeare," but the reference is a general one directed against actors as a class. Cf. Sidney Lee, *Life of Shakespeare*, chap. xii; also *Athenaeum*, London, November 13, 1886.

And—and—faith, I have almost forgot them; but I know it is something about saving your honour from drowning—O! it is very fine! I say, damn me, the man that writ these lines was the greatest poet the world ever produced. There is dignity of expression and emphasis of thinking, damn me.

It is well known that Fielding yielded to no man in his admiration of Shakespeare, and in this passage he ridicules not the very pretty poet, but the honor-loving Colonel himself. So in these college plays, the folly of Gullio is rendered but more apparent by his attempt to appreciate what is so far above his weak brain; or, to look at the matter from another point of view, even a brainless fop grasps the fact that Shakespeare is the pre-eminent writer of the day, and that he must profess the keenest admiration for the works of the dramatist if he desires to appear to be a man of intellect. Furthermore, in *P2* Burbage and Kemp are not represented as "rude, half-educated strolling players," and their praise of Shakespeare is to be taken as seriously as their strictures on the awkward stage presence of undergraduate actors. Clearly then, the Cambridge plays commend Shakespeare in a manner which seems half-hearted when compared with our modern estimates of his genius, yet in a manner quite extraordinary when we remember how rarely on the Elizabethan stage is a tribute paid to the work of a contemporary dramatist.[1]

That the high estimate placed on his writings by the scholars of St. John's was unknown to Shakespeare is incredible, and it is interesting to note, in this connection, that Shakespeare's friend and patron, Henry Wriothesley, third earl of Southampton, had been a student at St. John's (1585–89) and that he maintained throughout his life a deep interest in the college, sending his son there to be educated, and bestowing on the library a valuable collection of books and manuscripts. At the time of the production of *P2* he was in prison, implicated in the attempted insurrection of the Earl of Essex, yet Shakespeare must have heard of the dramatic activity at the *alma mater* of his great benefactor.[2] That

[1] Cf. Shakespeare's brief reference to Marlowe:

> Dead shepherd, now I feel thy saw of might,
> "Who ever loved that loved not at first sight."
>
> —*A.Y.L.I.*, III, v, 82.

[2] See Lee's *Shakespeare*, Appendices III, IV.

a dramatist who spoke of himself regretfully as an "unlettered clerk" would be unmoved by the acclaim of the university wits is beyond question. Some four years after Ben Jonson had been so roughly handled in *P2*, he produced successfully at Oxford and Cambridge his *Volpone*, and so delighted was he with the favor the colleges had shown this comedy that he dedicated it "to the most noble and equal sisters, the two famous Universities, for their love and acceptance shown to this poem in the presentation." Speaking of himself as "the grateful acknowledger" and declaring that he is "studious to justify" their bounty, throughout all the dedication—the longest he ever wrote—he shows unmistakably his pride in the applause of his academic audiences and his eager desire to retain their approval. It cannot be presumed that Shakespeare was less sensitive to the approbation of the scholarly world. Whatever opinion we hold of the autobiographic value of the sonnets, one fact is evident—that Shakespeare was touched to the heart by friendship and by appreciation of his work, and that he repaid the recognition of his own worth and of the value of his writings with a splendid gratitude as sincere in its feeling as it is exquisite in its expression. Would it not be remarkable if Shakespeare counted as little worth the praise of Cambridge, and more unnatural still if he made no grateful reference to it?

P2 was produced, as we have stated, between Christmas day, 1601, and January 5, 1602. On July 26, 1602, there was entered on the *Stationers' Register* "A booke called the *Revenge of Hamlett Prince* (*of*) *Denmark* as yt was lateli Acted by the Lord Chamberleyne his servants," and in 1603 appeared *The Tragicall Historie of Hamlet Prince of Denmarke* by William Shakespeare. "As it hath beene diuerse times acted by his Highnesse servants in the cittie of London: as also in the two Universities of Cambridge and Oxford and elsewhere." This, *Q1*, is undoubtedly the book mentioned the previous year in the *Register*, for in 1603 the Lord Chamberlain's Servants became the King's Players, and thus the change in the name of the troupe can be explained. The important fact, however, in considering the title of *Q1* is that this play, Shakespeare's first revision of the *Ur-Hamlet* (which we shall designate as *Z*) was acted at the Universities, and that it was a

success there is understood by such an announcement.[1] I have been unable to obtain information concerning all the known Shakespeare quartos, but an examination of photographic reproductions of thirty, including all the first quartos, shows that *Hamlet* is the only play advertised as having been performed at Cambridge.[2] This is significant. It now remains to fix as nearly as possible the date of its performance at Cambridge. It is a fair assumption that it did not precede the production of *P 2*, for a play so popular as *Hamlet* proved to be would have naturally impressed Shakespeare's admirers to such an extent that they would have made some reference to it, however slight, giving it at least as much mention as *Hieronimo* or *Richard III* received at their hands. Moreover, the play must have been acted very shortly before July 26, 1602. Clark and Wright have stated this point most clearly:

> We are inclined to think that it was acted not long before . . . . 26 July, 1602. One reason for this opinion is, that if the play had been long a popular one and had been frequently represented, the printer or publisher would have had many opportunities of procuring a more accurate copy than that from which the edition of 1603 was made. The errors of this edition, and the manifest haste with which it was printed seem to show that the play had only been acted a short time before, and that the publisher went to press with the first copy he could obtain, however imperfect. This supposition is favoured by the expression in the *Stationer's Register* "as it was lately acted," which would hardly have been used of a play which had long been popular.[3]

In other words, a few months after *P 2* is performed at Cambridge, *Hamlet* is acted there. It is but natural, we repeat, to seek in *Q1* some acknowledgment on Shakespeare's part of the praise Cambridge had bestowed on him, or, at the very least, some friendly tribute to the student body; and this, indeed, is not wanting. It is to be found, first, in the college atmosphere which Shakespeare adds to the *Hamlet* story, and, secondly, in the type of college student which Shakespeare depicts. These two points deserve to be treated at some length.

[1] The word "revision" implies the addition of so much new material that Shakespeare may properly be called the creator of *Hamlet*.

[2] "*Hamlet* was the only drama by Shakespeare that was acted in his lifetime at the two Universities," Lee, *Shakespeare*, chap. xiii.

[3] *Hamlet*, Clarendon Press, 1880, Preface, ix.

In the chronicle of Saxo Grammaticus there is naturally no mention of the University of Wittenberg, and Belleforest, who followed Saxo closely, has no reference to Hamlet's student days. As for Horatio, he is dimly discerned in a short reference to a nameless friend of Hamlet who warns and aids him.[1] It is in *Q1* and in the German *Hamlet*, *Der Bestrafte Brudermord oder Prinz Hamlet aus Dannemark* (which we shall designate as *D*), that we find the first reference to Wittenberg; moreover, in *Q1* Horatio is a student there, while in *D* he is a soldier at the court. This brings us face to face with the great problem in the study of the text of *Hamlet*. It is generally agreed that *Z*, which Shakespeare partially revised in *Q1* and which he further revised and enlarged in *Q2* (1604) was written by Kyd. Does *D* represent, in distorted form, this play by Kyd or is it a very faulty adaptation of Shakespeare's *Hamlet?* On this point scholars have been and are still divided.[2] Although the arguments against the theory that *D* derives from *Z* have been stated at greater length than the arguments for it, I believe that *D*, both because of its specific resemblances to Kyd's works and because of its general likeness, in language, character, and plot, to the pre-Shakespearean drama, certainly represents *Z*, though in a sadly mangled form, and this theory, moreover, adapts itself perfectly to the contention of this

[1] See Robert Gericke, *Hamlet-Quellen* (Leipzig, 1881), pp. l–lii.

[2] For the theory that *D* is derived from Shakespeare's *Hamlet* see the articles by W. Creizenach in *Berichte der philol.-histor. Classe der Königl. Sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, p. 1 (Leipzig, 1887); *Schauspiele der englischen Komödianten, deutsche Nationalliteratur* (Berlin u. Stuttgart), Vol. XXIII, 1889; "'Der bestrafte Brudermord' and Its Relation to Shakespeare's *Hamlet*," *Modern Philology*, Vol. II, p. 249 (Chicago, 1904); Gustav Tanger, "'Der bestrafte Brudermord' u. sein Verhältniss zu Shakespeare's *Hamlet*," in *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, Vol. XXIII, p. 224, 1888; cf. also E. Herz, "Englische Schauspieler u. englisches Schauspiel zur Zeit Shakespeares in Deutschland," in Litzmann's *Theatergeschictliche Forschungen*, Vol. XVIII, p. 87 (Hamburg u. Leipzig, 1903); Edward Dowden, *Hamlet*, Introduction, p. xiv (London, 1899); F. S. Boas, *Thomas Kyd*, Introduction, p. xlviii (London, 1901); A. C. Bradley, *Shakespearean Tragedy*, p. 406, note (London, 1904). For the theory that *D* is derived from *Z* see R. G. Latham, *Two Dissertations on the Hamlet of Saxo Grammaticus and of Shakespeare* (London, 1872); W. H. Widgery, *Harness Prize Essay* (London, 1880); H. H. Furness, *Hamlet*, Vol. II, p. 120 (Philadelphia, 1877); John Corbin, "The German *Hamlet* and the Earlier English Versions," *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, Vol. V (Boston, 1896); A. H. Thorndike, "*Hamlet* and Contemporary Revenge Plays" in *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, Vol. XVII, No. 2 (Baltimore, 1902); J. Schick, "Die Entstehung des *Hamlet*" in *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, Vol. XXVIII, 1902: M. B. Evans, "*Der Bestrafte Brudermord;*" *sein Verhältniss zu Shakespeare's* Hamlet (Hamburg u. Leipzig, 1902); "'Der Bestrafte Brudermord' and Shakespeare's *Hamlet*," *Modern Philology*, Vol. II, 1905; C. M. Lewis, *The Genesis of Hamlet* (New York, 1907).

paper. To treat this matter in detail would be to lose the thread of our argument without reason, for the authorities cited in the note offer a most thorough discussion of the whole question.

As has been stated, in *Q1* Horatio is a student; in *D* he is a soldier.[1] In spite of the fact that *D* has received at the hands of its adaptors and revisers "many alterations and dilutions," and that the text cannot be traced earlier than 1710,[2] that natural desire to give the play a German setting, seen so plainly in this late text, may be attributed also to the earliest adaptor, to the earliest text. That Hamlet, in *D*, had been a student at Wittenberg can scarcely be explained by this tendency, for that university was well known in England and might well be mentioned by a London dramatist. The Faustus of Marlowe's play was a student at "Wertenberg" and Lyly in his *Euphues*, published 1579, takes "Wittenberge" to represent the German universities, as Paris represents the scholarship of France.[3] On the other hand, when we find in *D* mention of Hamburg and Saxony; when we find the story, well known to Elizabethan dramatists,[4] of a murder confessed at a play transferred from England to Strassburg; when we find a legend of "a cavalier in Anion" which appears also in contemporary plays,[5] we have a right to assume that these German allusions had been added and that the actors concluded that the play needed more local coloring. This being the case, why is not Horatio a student at Wittenberg in *D* as he is in *Q1*? If the German adaptor could have one more allusion to a German town, would he wilfully forego it? Horatio is an important character and if the adaptor of *D* had seen or read *Q1* and but dimly remembered it, is it probable that he would forget that such a prominent person as the confidant of the Prince was a student? We are led to the conclusion that Horatio is a soldier in *D* because he was a soldier in *Z*, on which *D* is based.

[1] See *Fratricide Punished* (*D*), Act I, scene 3. It can be consulted most conveniently in Furness' *Variorum Hamlet*, Vol. II.

[2] See Cohn's *Shakespeare in Germany in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London, 1865). Cohn derives *D* from *Z*. Cf. Widgery, *Harness Prize Essay*, pp. 104–25.

[3] See Arber's edition of *Euphues*, p. 140 (London, 1868).

[4] See the play, *A Warning for Faire Women* (London, 1599), reprinted in R. Simpson's *School of Shakespeare* (London, 1878), also Thomas Heywood's *Apology for Actors*, Book III (London, 1612).

[5] See *D*, Act II, scenes 4, 7; cf. Boas, *Kyd*, xlviii; Furness, *Hamlet*, Vol. II, p. 118.

This explains the inconsistency in the character of Horatio. In *Q1*, as in *Q2*, he has hardly appeared in the opening scene of the first act, when we are told that he is a scholar. "Thou art a scholler, speake to it Horatio." As the ghost disappears, Marcellus asks Horatio whether it is not like the king, to which he replies:

> As thou art to thy selfe
> Such was the very armor he had on,
> When he the ambitious Norway combated.
> So frownd he once, when in an angry parle
> He smot the sleaded pollax on the yce,
> Tis strange.[1]

Here Horatio talks as a veteran who had witnessed the king's duel with Fortinbras, and who had followed him in at least one of his campaigns. Dowden avoids this difficulty by explaining that Horatio did not necessarily witness the duel, and that "the armour would be remembered and be pointed out, when worn later."[2] While this is a possible interpretation, it is certainly not the natural one. Horatio speaks as an old soldier, and when his comrades in arms wish an explanation of the ghost's appearance, it is Horatio who gives the account of the fight with Fortinbras and explains the threatened invasion. We hardly expect a student at Wittenberg to be better informed on the military history of Denmark than the members of the Danish army. Of course it is not impossible that Horatio turned from the camp to the study, that he left the army for the university, but it does not seem probable. If we conclude that Shakespeare, in changing Horatio from a soldier to a student, did not remove all the inconsistencies such a change involved, we have an explanation that accords with Shakespeare's manner of work in other plays. Moreover, it is not difficult to see why Shakespeare retained the lines that show Horatio to be a soldier. It was essential to the story that Horatio should recognize the ghost, and therefore the dramatist retained the soldier's recollections of his old commander, which makes the identification indisputable. This point established, Horatio becomes the scholar who has seen the king but once, and to whom the

[1] *Q1; Q2* follows this word for word with slight changes of spelling.

[2] Dowden, *Hamlet*, p. 7, note.

court is unfamiliar ground. The action in the opening pages is so rapid, the lines in the first scenes are spoken so hurriedly that the spectator, absorbed in the unfolding of an exciting plot, does not perceive the inconsistency, and is accordingly no more disturbed by it than by the perplexing "double time" in Othello.

This theory that Horatio in *Z*, as in *D*, was a soldier, helps to explain the vexed question of Horatio's age. Certainly the impression given by the play is that Hamlet and Horatio are equal in years. In *Q1* Hamlet's age is not given, though it is a common statement that he is nineteen.[1] In *Q2* he is plainly thirty, therefore Horatio, who must have been fairly old when he witnessed the duel between Hamlet's father and Fortinbras, is at least fifty, for that contest took place on the day Hamlet was born. Is not this an inconsistency arising from the composite character of Horatio, part scholar, part soldier?

There is yet another aspect of the case to be considered. If, as we maintain, Horatio was changed from a soldier to a student as a tribute to the universities, it certainly follows that *Q1*, the version acted at Cambridge, should have the character of Horatio clearly and fully drawn. Such, indeed, is the case. Comparing the Horatio of *Q1* with the Horatio of *Q2*, the enlarged version, we shall find but very little change. It is true that some interesting lines are added in *Q2*, and it is important to note these passages. They are as follows: Horatio's description of the portents in Rome, "a little ere the mightiest Julius fell" (Act I, scene 2), is missing in *Q1;* Horatio does not appear in *Q1* as the protector of the distraught Ophelia; in *Q1* Horatio receives letters from Hamlet telling of his escape from "Gilderstone and Rossencraft," and he discloses this to the queen, while in *Q2* Hamlet himself, after his return to Elsinore, tells Horatio of his escape; *Q1* omits some of Horatio's short comments in the graveyard scene and in the conversation with Osric, and gives the two last speeches of Horatio, at the very close of the play, in shortened form. What we most miss in *Q1* is Horatio's quiet attempt to recall the Prince from those thoughts that wander through eternity to the path of safety

[1] Bradley affirms that all that can be gathered from the text is that Hamlet was "more than twelve," *Shakespearean Tragedy*, p. 408. Cf. Sir Edward Sullivan, "On Hamlet's Age," *Transactions of the New Shakspere Society*, XXVII.

and duty: "Twere to consider too curiously to consider so." In leaving this comparison of the two quartos, it must be mentioned that Hamlet's noble speech to his friend, in which, breaking down the reserve that even the closest companions feel, he discloses his admiration for one who is not passion's slave, appears in *Q1* in a short fifteen-line version which compares most unfavorably with the perfected version in *Q2*. With all these differences noted, the surprising consideration is not that they exist, but that they are not greater, especially when we observe the great changes made in *Q2* in the parts of Claudius, Gertrude, and Laertes, to say nothing of Hamlet himself.[1] On the other hand, in several scenes in which Horatio appears (for example, in Act I) *Q1* and *Q2* are practically the same text. It is therefore a safe assertion that Horatio, as he was presented to the students of Cambridge, was an important character, drawn at length, and that in this character Shakespeare adds the college element to the drama.

There is one minor point on which we may touch before leaving this part of the discussion. In *Q1* appears the allusion to Corambis (Polonius) as an actor at the university.

Hamlet. My lord, you playd in the Universitie.
Corambis. That I did my L: and I was counted a good actor.
Hamlet. What did you enact there?
Corambis. My lord, I did act Julius Caesar, I was killed in the Capitoll, Brutus killed me.
Hamlet. It was a brute part of him, to kill so capitall a calfe.

Mr. Fleay concludes from these lines that the actor who took the part of Polonius had been cast for Caesar in Shakespeare's tragedy.[2] Is not this, however, merely an allusion to undergraduate plays, inserted to please a student audience?

The second point of our contention is that in Horatio Shakespeare departs from the type of student depicted in the Elizabethan drama. As a matter of fact, the university scholar is a rare figure. The soldier, the gull, the fop, the amorist, the bravo, the lord, the peasant, men of all classes and types cross and recross the stage,

[1] For a very careful comparison of the texts of *Q1* and *Q2*, see Tanger's article in *Transactions of the New Shakspere Society*, IX, Part II. I am utterly unable to accept the conclusions drawn from this comparison.

[2] *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 229 (London, 1886).

but in this throng of characters there are but few students.[1] Of all the dramatists, we should expect Ben Jonson, both because of his scholarly tastes and his wide vision, to present a student character in one of his plays, but we search for him in vain. In the opening lines of *Every Man in His Humour*, Knowell, speaking of his son, says:

> He is a scholar, if a man may trust
> The liberal voice of fame in her report,
> Of good account in both our Universities
> Either of which hath favoured him with graces,

but we soon find that young Knowell has left the university behind him and he appears not as a student, but as a young man about town. In the list of characters prefixed to *Every Man out of His Humour*, we find Fungoso, "a student; one that has reveled in his time, and follows the fashions afar off, like a spy." On examining the play, we find that while Fungoso is supposed to be studying at the Inns of Court, he represents, not the student, but the fop, who vainly strives to be in the fashion.

> Unlucky as Fungoso in the play,
> These sparks with awkward vanity display
> What the fine gentlemen wore yesterday.[2]

Lovell, in his *New Inn*, is described as a "scholar," and Compass, in the *Magnetic Lady*, is called a "scholar mathematick," but both of these characters have left their college days far behind them. Thus, while Jonson introduces in his plays college-bred men, he does not give us the undergraduate, and this is typical of the Elizabethan dramatists.

The undergraduate, however, does figure in the literature of the day. John Lyly, who had passed several years at Oxford, refers in his popular novel to students and student life. The following lines show the nature of his comments:

Moreover, who doth know a scholler by his habite? Is there any hat of so unseemely a fashion, anye doublet of so long a waste, any hose so

[1] A rapid reading of 9 plays by Ford, 16 by Chapman, 18 by Massinger, 19 by Dekker, 22 by Thomas Heywood, and 51 by Beaumont and Fletcher, confirms this opinion. Laureo, in Dekker's *Patient Grissil*, has been nine years at the University, and at the opening of the play, leaves college because of his poverty. He is the one college student in all these dramas. Several "poor scholars" are mentioned in them, but they are not connected with a university.

[2] Pope, *Essay on Criticism*, ll. 329, 330.

short, any attyre, either so costly or so courtly, either so straunge in making, or so monstrous in wearing, that it is not worn of a Scholler? Have they not now in steede of black cloth blacke velvet, in steede of course sackecloth, fine silke? Be they not more lyke courtiers than schollers, more like stage-players than students, more like ruffians of Naples than disputers in Athens? I would to god they did not imitate al other nations in ye vice of the minde, as they doe in the attire of their body, for certeinely as there is no nation whose fashion in apparel they do not use, so there is no wickednesse publyshed in anye place, that they do not practice. . . . . Is it not become a bye word amongst the common people, that they had rather sende their children to the carte than to the Universitie, being induced so to say, for the abuse that reigneth in the Universities?[1]

This is hardly a favorable introduction to a consideration of student characters, and yet two dramatists give us as disagreeable a picture of the collegian as does Lyly. We shall select two plays, one written before the appearance of *Q1*, the other, after it—*Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, by Greene, and *A Chaste Maid in Cheapside*, by Middleton.[2] In Greene's play we find the scene laid at Oxford, and naturally students appear. We have a graceful description of the college town:

> These Oxford schools
> Are richly seated near the river side:
> The mountains full of fat and fallow deer,
> The battling pastures lade with kine and flocks,
> The town gorgeous with high built colleges,
> And scholars seemly in their grave attire,
> Learned in searching principles of art.

Unfortunately the seemly scholars, so far as the undergraduates are concerned, are not shown us, but in their stead we have the student Miles, a clown, a buffoon of the lowest order. In Middleton's comedy we have Tim Yellowhammer brought with his tutor from Cambridge to London. This young hopeful, a broadly comic character, is remarkable chiefly for his bad Latin, and for the ease with which a woman of the town, posing as a Welsh heiress, gulls him into marriage.

[1] Arber's *Euphues*, pp. 139–41; also p. 190.

[2] *Friar Bacon* was published in 1594; *A Chaste Maid*, in 1630. Henslowe's diary records that *Friar Bacon* was acted February 19, 1592; we have no means of fixing the date of the production of *A Chaste Maid*, but it certainly is later than the production of *Q1*.

Turning from these discreditable representatives of the student class, we find Horatio to be one of the most admirable, one of the most lovable characters in English dramatic literature.[1] He is a Dane, but Hamlet has met him, not at Elsinore, but at Wittenberg, for Horatio is not of the court set—he has seen Hamlet's father but once, he is unacquainted with Osric and Laertes, and he asks naïvely, on hearing from the battlements the sounds of the king's carousing, whether such revelry is customary at court. His poverty would bar him from the palace, for he is so poor that he "has suffered all," yet the poor man's contumely he has borne unembittered, and Hamlet, a prince out of his sphere, is drawn irresistibly to this generous, strong, yet modest student. On hearing the news of the king's death, he leaves the university to attend the funeral, and with characteristic modesty forbears even to see his friend in his great sorrow. When Hamlet meets him, and inquires with surprise why he has left the lecture halls, he answers lamely, to spare his friend's feelings, that he is playing truant—"cutting," the American student would say. The instant refusal of Hamlet to accept this statement discloses the manner of Horatio's life, and though the text does not show it, Hamlet evidently entreats his friend to remain with him and aid him. Every trait in the man is admirable. When Ophelia has no helper, it is Horatio who insists that the queen must see her. Though he cannot avert the final catastrophe, his anxiety for Hamlet is always apparent, whether on the battlements, when he restrains the prince from following the ghost, or before the fencing match, when he urges him to postpone the bout. The finer touches are not lacking in this picture, as when Horatio shows a quiet humor in his comment on Osric, or when he bluntly refuses to rate Hamlet's fencing skill as highly as the prince desired. His desperate attempt to drink the dregs of the poison, his consenting to live that he may fulfil Hamlet's last request, complete the portrait of this scholar, a portrait rarely surpassed, as the friendship of Hamlet and Horatio, expressed in so few words, is the finest conception of a

[1] It is strange that so little has been written about him. The forty-two volumes of the *Jahrbuch* contain many articles on *Hamlet*, but the only references to Horatio are Vols. VI, pp. 309, 310; XIX, pp. 32, 33; XXIX, pp. 231–39. Bradley, in his illuminating study of *Hamlet*, passes by "the beautiful character of Horatio." See his *Shakespearean Tragedy*, p. 166.

college friendship in the English drama. And when all is done, when Horatio has told of the carnal, bloody, and unnatural acts, the accidental judgments, casual slaughters, he receives no honors, but (we must believe) he returns to the university, as quietly as he had left it, to resume the life of a poor scholar.

This analysis of the character of Horatio completes the argument, for it proves beyond question that Shakespeare, when he drew him, ennobled student character. That Shakespeare was led to do this because his works had been commended in the *Parnassus* plays, and by the additional reason that Hamlet was acted at Cambridge, is a theory we have endeavored to justify. Absolute proof in such a matter can never be obtained but we have brought forward several facts that support such a theory. If Shakespearean scholars decide that it is merely an interesting conjecture, even then it may be deemed worthy of consideration, for it serves to place in a new light a noble nature in the profoundest of English tragedies.

EDWARD BLISS REED

YALE COLLEGE

SIX NOTES

GEORGE HERBERT, *VERTUE* 6

Professor Palmer, annotating—

> Sweet rose, whose hue angrie and brave
> Bids the rash gazer wipe his eye,

refers to *Faith* 38,

> With bushie groves, pricking the looker's eie,

and *Frailtie* 15, 16,

> That which was dust before doth quickly rise,
> And prick mine eyes.

NED., under *Gazer*, quotes (1590) Greene, *Never too Late* 2 (1600):

> Lockes where loue did sit and twine
> Nets to snare the gazers eyne.

But "rash gazer," and the suggestion of the color, Herbert may well have obtained from *The Return from Parnassus* (1602?), near the beginning. Judicio speaks:

> Drayton's sweet muse is like a *sanguine* dye,
> Able to ravish the *rash gazer's eye.*

PARADISE LOST III, 1–8

There seems to be some reason for assuming that Milton, when he wrote the opening lines of Book III of *Paradise Lost*, was acquainted with certain passages of Eusebius' writings concerning Constantine. The following quotations are from the Bagster translation (*Greek Ecclesiastical Historians*, 1845). The text before me is Heikel's (Leipzig, 1902).

Eusebius, *Oration in Praise of Constantine*, chap. i:

> Supreme and pre-eminent Ruler of the universe, He shares the glory of His Father's kingdom: for He is that Light which, transcendent above the universe, encircles the Father's person, *interposing and dividing between the eternal and uncreated Essence* and all derived existence (*χορεῦον μεσιτεῦόν τε καὶ διείργον τῆς τῶν γενητῶν οὐσίας τὴν ἄναρχον καὶ*

ἀγένητον ἰδέαν); that Light which, streaming from on high, proceeds from that Deity who knows not origin or end, and illumines the super-celestial regions, and all that heaven itself contains, with the radiance of wisdom bright beyond the splendor of the sun.

Ibid., chap. xii:

In Him we see Light, even the spiritual offspring of inexpressible Light.

With these compare:

Bright effluence of bright essence increate.

Then on the general idea of a "fountain" for light, compare the following, from chaps. i, vi, and xii, respectively:

The countless multitudes of angels, the companies of archangels, the quires of holy spirits, draw from and reflect His radiance as from the fountains of everlasting light (ὥσπερ ἐξ ἀενάων φωτὸς πηγῶν).

Infinite hosts of light surround the Almighty Sovereign, each surpassing the splendor of the sun, glorious and resplendent, with rays derived from the everlasting source of light (τῆς αἰδίου πηγῆς).

From Him, as from an everlasting fountain (πηγῆς), the sun, the moon, and stars receive their light.

Cf. *P. L.*, III, 375 ff.; VII, 364; *P. R.*, IV, 289.

With "unapproachèd light" (l. 4), compare (from chaps. i and xii):

The ineffable splendor of the glory which surrounds Him repels the gaze of every eye from His divine majesty.

And He Himself dwelling as Sovereign in secret and undiscovered regions of unapproachable light.

The Biblical passages in question are such as I Cor. 4:4; Col. 1:15; I Tim. 6:16; Heb. 1:3.

JONSON, *THE NEW INN* 3, 1, 33

In extension of Tennant's note in his edition of the play (*Yale Studies in English* XXXIV), p. 222, I subjoin the following:

Du Bartas' *First Week*, published in 1579, was very likely indebted to Ramus. In Sylvester's translation (Week 1, Day 6, ll. 908–17) the passage runs:

Once, as this Artist (more with mirth then meat)
Feasted some friends that he esteeméd great,
From under's hand an Iron Fly flew out,
Which having showne a perfect Round-about,

With weary wings return'd unto her Master,
And (as judicious) on his arme she plac't her.
O divine wit! that in the narrow womb
Of a small fly, could finde sufficient room
For all those Springs, wheels, counterpoint, and chains,
Which stood in stead of life, and spur, and rains.

Ben Jonson wrote a commendatory epigram for Sylvester's translation, with which compare his remarks in his *Conversations with Drummond.*

Gassendi, in his life of Regiomontanus, quotes Ramus' account of the fly. Giambattista della Porta (*ca.* 1543–1615), Kircher (1602–80), Lana (1631–87), and Wilkins, *Math. Magic*, 1648 (*Math. and Phil. Works* [1802], pp. 194, 195), also repeat the information.

Earlier than all these except Ramus is the statement by John Dee, in his preface (written February 9, 1570) to Billingsley's translation of Euclid (Sig. Aj, *verso*):

Meruaylous was the workemanshyp, of late dayes, performed by good skill of Trochilike, &c. For in Noremberge, A flye of Iern, being let out of the Artificers hand, did (as it were) fly about by the gestes, at the table, and at length, as though it were weary, retourne to his masters hand agayne.

This, again, is evidently based upon Ramus' account of the year before.

We thus arrive at this singular result:

1. Lipsius' fly is not Lipsius', but Ramus'.
2. Ramus' fly is not Ramus', but Müller's.
3. Müller's fly is not Müller's, but that of one or more artificers in his employ, or under his influence.

The prototype of such devices (Ramus also tells of an eagle) is to be found in the dove constructed by Archytas (Aulus Gellius 10, 12).

CANDLES TO MEASURE TIME

A parallel to Alfred's use of candles for the measurement of time (*Asser*, ed. Stevenson, chap. civ) is to be found in Herman Melville, *Typee*, chap. xxviii:

At this supper we were lighted by several of the native tapers, held in the hands of young girls. These tapers are most ingeniously made.

There is a nut abounding in the valley, called by the Typees "armor," closely resembling our common horse-chestnut. The shell is broken, and the contents extracted whole. Any number of these are strung at pleasure upon the long elastic fibre that traverses the branches of the cocoa-nut tree. Some of these tapers are eight and ten feet in length; but being perfectly flexible, one end is held in a coil, while the other is lighted. The nut burns with a fitful bluish flame, and the oil that it contains is exhausted in about ten minutes. As one burns down, the next becomes ignited, and the ashes of the former are knocked into a cocoanut shell kept for the purpose. This primitive candle requires continual attention, and must be constantly held in the hand. The person so employed marks the lapse of time by the number of nuts consumed, which is easily learned by counting the bits of tappa distributed at regular intervals along the string.

SHAKESPEARE, *RICHARD II* II, 1, 41 ff.

In John of Gaunt's second long speech occur certain remarkable lines, well known to most lovers of English poetry. One thought suggested is that of England's good fortune in being so defended by Nature, the same which Tennyson, very likely with these lines in mind, expressed by the phrase (*To the Queen*):

> Compassed by the inviolate sea.

The relevant lines of Shakespeare are these:

> This fortress built by Nature for herself
> Against infection and the hand of war.
> . . . . . .
> The silver sea,
> Which serves it in the office of a wall
> Against the envy of less happier lands.
> England, bound in with the triumphant sea.

There are three chief points to be considered:

1. England is protected as by a wall, without effort on the part of man.

2. This defense has been provided by Nature, personified by the poet.

3. The defense is provided against the envy of less fortunate nations.

Shakespeare here displays patriotic pride such as an Englishman of the spacious times of great Elizabeth might well feel. But

Englishmen were not the first to feel national pride, nor the first to express it in this way. Such sentiments would seem as natural in the mouth of a Roman writer as of an English one; and, as a matter of fact, we find remarkable parallels to these lines in Latin literature, parallels covering all three of the points enumerated above.

The first passage in order of time is from Cicero's speech on the Consular Provinces dating from 56 B. C. Here the orator says (14, 33):

> Nature had previously protected Italy by the Alps, not without some especial kindness of the gods in providing us with such a bulwark. For if that road had been open to the savage disposition and vast numbers of the Gauls, this city would never have been the home and chosen seat of the empire of the world.

Passing over Livy, who simply remarks (5, 34) that the Alps were opposed to the progress of Bellovesus into Italy, we come to Pliny, who says (3, 23) that the Alps exceed in breadth

> a hundred miles, where they separate Germany from Italy, but do not elsewhere equal seventy miles, being, as it were, reduced by the providence of Nature.

Next Juvenal, speaking of Hannibal, says (10, 152): "Nature barred his path by Alps and snow." Then an unknown panegyrist of the emperor Maximian (about 290), sometimes known as Mamertinus, addresses the emperor:

> . . . Your journeys, in the very days of winter, over those summits of the Alps which are neighbors to the sky, and by which Nature has defended (*vallavit*) Italy.

Finally, we may quote from Rutilius Namatianus, a native of Gaul, whose poem dates from 416 (2, 31–40):

> If we admit that the world was framed in some determinate fashion, and that this great fabric is the contrivance of a god, we must believe that he threw up the Apennines as a defense for Italy, so that its fastnesses are hardly to be scaled by the mountaineers themselves [reading *suis*, with Baehrens, for *viis*]. Fearing the envy of the northern peoples, Nature considered that she had done too little in opposing the Alps to their menaces. In like manner she has intrenched the vital parts with various members, nor has been content with a single inclosure for what

is so precious (*pretiosa*). The future Rome deserved to be environed round with such variety of fortifications, and already in advance was the care of the gods.

The differences between Shakespeare and the Latin writers are non-essential. Italy is protected by the mountains, England by the sea; this is all, unless we insist on the word "infection." On the other hand, the correspondences are striking, especially with Rutilius, the author nearest to him in time and race. Here we have "envy" (*invidiam timuit Natura*), and, singularly enough, though this may be a mere accident, the word "precious," which Shakespeare employs in the same context:

> This precious stone set in the silver sea.

There was a Roman edition of Rutilius, published in 1582, which Shakespeare might have consulted, the *editio princeps* dating from 1520.

It is possible, too, that Shakespeare might have had in mind Petrarch's "Ode to the Princes of Italy" (No. 128 of the *Rime*), though here the significant word "envy" is wanting. Lines 33–35 run in Cayley's translation:

> Well was our need by Nature recognized,
> When with her Alps she threw
> A screen betwixt us and the Teutons' rage.

Further search may reveal other possible intermediaries than the one mentioned below. While it is, of course, true that Shakespeare or some English predecessor may have originated the thought in question, yet the possibility, at least, of influence from the Roman genius ought not to be overlooked.

With regard to the sea in the office of a wall, Shakespeare may well have derived a hint from the *Libel of English Policie* (1436–7). Here, toward the end, we read (Hakluyt, 1589):

> Keep than the sea about in speciall,
> Which of England is the towne wall.
> As though England were likened to a citie,
> And the wall environ were the see.
> Kepe then the sea that is the wall of England:
> And than is England kept by Goddes hande;

That as for anything that is without,
England were at ease withouten doubt,
And thus should every lond one with another
Entercommon, as brother with his brother,
And live together werrelesse in unitie,
Without rancour in very charitie.

CHAUCER, *L. G. W.*, PROL. 334 (358)

In *Westward Ho* (1607), Act I, scene 1 (ed. Shepherd, London, 1873, p. 291) Mistress Honeysuckle, replying to a question of Mistress Tenterhook, says: "Why as stale as a Country Ostes, an Exchange Sempster, or a *Court Landresse?*"[1] This seems clearly to be a reminiscence of Chaucer, *Prol. Leg. Good Women* A, 333, 334:

Envye (I prey to god yeve hir mischaunce!)
Is lavender in the grete court alway;

Prol. B, 358:

Envye is lavender of the court alway.

And this, as is well known, goes back to Dante, *Inferno* 13, 64–66:

La meretrice che mai dall' ospizio
Di Cesare non torse gli occhi pulti,
Morte comune, e delle corti vizio.

Skeat refers to Gower, *Conf. Am.* 2, 3095 ff. This reads:

Senec witnesseth openly
How that Envie proprely
Is of the Court the comon wenche,
And halt taverne for to schenche
That drink which maketh the herte brenne.

[1] Other instances are—*Westward Ho*, p. 237:
"*M. Wife.* Would you haue mee turne common sinner, or sell my apparell to my wastcoat and become a Landresse?
"*Iust.* No Landresse, deere wife, though your credit would goe farre with Gentlemen for taking vp of Linnen; no Landresse?"
Webster, *White Devil* 4, ll. 87–89 (ed. Sampson, p. 94):

Did I want
Ten leash of curtisans, it would furnish me;
Nay, lawndresse three armies.

Devil's Law Case, 1, 2 [Romelio to Winifred]: "You, lady of the laundry, come hither."

In the *Mirour de l'Omme* 3829–40, Gower has:

> Envie ensur tout autre vice
> Est la plus vaine et la plus nice;
> Siccomme ly sages la repute,
> Envie est celle peccatrice,
> Qes nobles courts de son office
> Demoert et est commune pute.
> A les plus sages plus despute,
> A les plus fortz plus fait salute,
> Et as plus riches d'avarice
> Plus fait Envie sa poursute.
> A son povoir sovent transmute
> L'onour d'autry de sa malice.

No one has yet brought to light an earlier source than Dante, notwithstanding the reference to Seneca.

ALBERT S. COOK

YALE UNIVERSITY

ARTHUR IN OLD FRENCH POETRY NOT OF THE BRETON CYCLE

It will never be possible to explain the disparity which exists between the Arthur of history and the Arthur of romance unless more solid historical data be forthcoming than are at present available. Of the group of heroes who engaged the attention of the cultured mediaeval world, Arthur stands between Tristan who is altogether mythical and Charlemagne and Alexander who represent heroes of history.[1]

This equivocal position occupied by the Breton hero oftentimes afforded occasion for the disparagement of his name, in mediaeval literature, outside of the Breton cycle proper, and helped to retard the progress he would otherwise have made had he been altogether mythical. For example, in the *Roman de Brut* of Wace, although it is virtually a translation of Geoffrey's *Historia*, there is a certain embarrassment on the part of the Anglo-Norman poet when he treats of Arthur, whose status in history or romance he seems unable to determine for himself.[2] The compatriots of Wace reveal a similar hesitation with reference to Arthur's historical reality. In all likelihood the identification of Arthur with chivalry would have occurred first in the poetry written in England among the Anglo-Norman *trouvères* if Arthur's poetic attributes had had a readier acceptance among them. As it is, neither the Normans in England nor those on the continent have left to the modern world anything that betrays a poetic appreciation of the Arthur of chivalry. This fact serves to show why the Arthur of romance appeared comparatively late in the poetic literature of chivalry, and had it not been for Chrestien de Troyes and the court of Marie de Champagne, Arthur would have remained a subordinate figure in mediaeval French romance.[3]

[1] A treatment of some of the problems connected with the Arthur of history is given in *Germania*, Vol. XII, by Holtzmann on *Artus*, pp. 257–84.

[2] Cf. *Roman de Brut*, vss. 13681–82 and 13688–89; *Roman de Rou*, vss. 11515 ff.

[3] Cf. the *Roman de Brut* of Wace, vss. 8955–68 and 9047–52, and Gauchier de Dourdan, *Perceval le Gallois* (ed. Potvin, Mons, 1866), vss. 34137–80, as an indication of the development of the romantic idea concerning Arthur, before and after Chrestien de Troyes, in the second half of the twelfth century.

At this court, about the middle of the twelfth century, the military-Arthur ideal of the north first came into touch with the influences from Provence and made of Geoffrey's Arthur a type for the social life of that age. This Arthur of peace was the creation in poetry of Chrestien de Troyes and the conventional hero of nearly all of this poet's work.

The Breton cycle in which Arthur figures as the embodiment of the social or chivalry ideal flourished during the relatively brief period of half a century. In the case of the *chansons de geste* it is quite otherwise, inasmuch as their *floruit* includes a period long enough to overlap the Breton cycle poetry both at its beginning and at its end. Even though the romances of chivalry or court epic appeared later than the *chansons de geste*, it is to be noticed that many of the poems of the national epic which appeared subsequent to the Arthurian cycle took on gradually the general character of the latter class through the influence of the strictly Breton romances. *Auberi le Bourguignon*, *Huon de Bordeaux*, and *Ogier le Danois*, with their admixture of other than national epic elements, show to what degree the court poetry modified the later epic, particularly in the first half of the thirteenth century.

From this group of sources, just mentioned above, it is possible to gather considerable data concerning Arthur which, at the same time, reveal the effect of the poetry of the Breton cycle upon the other branches in vogue during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, namely, the cycles of Alexander, of the Crusades and of Charlemagne, together with poems such as *Richars li Biaus* which lie outside the national epic between the *chansons de geste* aud the *romans d'aventure*.

With the exception of a few writers who mention Arthur as connected with romance early in the twelfth century,[1] and leaving aside poems like the *Roman de Thèbes* and *Ille et Galeron* which use his name only incidentally in order to magnify into heroic

[1] Cf. Marcabrun, cited in *Romania* VI, p. 123; Josephus Iscanus, *De Bello Trojano*, III, pp. 472-73 (London, 1825); *Mon. Germ.* (ed. Waitz, 1879), Vol. XXIV, p. 607, ll. 14-17: "Proinde militem quendam veteranum Robertum dictum Constantinensem, qui de Romanis imperatoribus et de Karlomanno de Rolando et Olivero et de Arthuro Brittaniae rege eum instruebat et aures eius demulcebat;" this was said by Lambert d'Ardres of the Count of Guines in Picardy, who gathered men of learning about him to teach him.

proportions the events there described, Arthur does not appear in French writings until the time of the Tristan poetry.[1]

In the beginning, Arthur and Tristan represented quite separate legends, since Geoffrey of Monmouth does not know Tristan, and it is safe to infer that the union of the Arthur and Tristan legends became common only after Béroul. Arthur's relation to the Tristan legend in either Béroul or Thomas is not vital to the narrative. In Thomas' poem, which is the best specimen of Tristan poetry extant, Arthur's name is employed merely for poetic comparison and to give a clearer idea of the time in which the adventures of his hero and heroine take place.[2] In Béroul, Arthur, with his knights, journeys from the north down to Cornwall to be present at the trial of Iseut and to serve as her defender.[3] The presence of Arthur in each of the fragment poems is occasioned directly, as it happens, by Iseut; it is Thomas who makes Iseut recall Arthur's combat with the giant Ritho, on account of a similar adventure which befell Tristan in Spain; Béroul introduces Arthur into his narrative by having Iseut suggest to King Marc that he summon him to her trial.[4] As to the details of characterization of Arthur in Béroul, the usual features are present—Arthur as protector and example of generosity; the knights; the Round Table; in short, the traditional heroic figure of romance as it had evolved toward the close of the twelfth century and, possibly, borrowed from Chrestien de Troyes by the successor of Béroul to add incident or variety to the Tristan theme.[5]

Near this same period, both in the *Roman d'Alexandre* and in the *Roman de Renart* are to be found instances where the name of Arthur replaces that of some classical fable hero, a substitution due probably to the general interest which the Breton cycle poems

[1] Cf. *Roman de Thèbes* (ed. Constans, 1890), Vol. III, Appendix V, p. 306, vss. 13271-72: Ainc puis le tans au roi Artu N'oI on parler de tel fu;" *Ille et Galeron* (ed. Foerster, Halle 1891), vss. 2805-6: "Et si les fiert de tel vertu C'ainc puis le tans le roi Artu."

[2] Cf. *Roman de Tristan* (ed. Bédier, 1902), vss. 714-80.

[3] Cf. *Roman de Tristan* (ed. Muret, 1903), vss. 3542-54; 4141-71.

[4] Cf. *ibid.*, vss. 3232-91; exception should be made here of the episode in which the dwarf Frocin proposed to King Marc, as a ruse, to send Tristan with a message to Arthur who was then in the north of England; cf. vss. 643-54.

[5] Cf. *ibid.*, vss. 3735-43.

were creating at this time and the prominence which they gave to Arthur.[1]

In all the poetry of this epoch cases are very common where Arthur's name is introduced on account of the exigencies of the rhyme; in fact the use of this device accounts for the relatively frequent mention of this hero's name in poetry where it has no special relation to the context of the narrative. For example, in *Aiol*, the young hero's charger, *Marchegai*, is likened to those steeds of King Arthur which none but their master could approach.[2] The French editors find no explanation for the name of Arthur in the passage, while Foerster, in his edition, cannot parallel the reference to Arthur, but adds that numerous instances of similar horses exist in the *chansons de geste*.[3] In view of the common practice of filling out a line with the name of an already well-known hero, the attribution to Arthur of these fabulous animals is a convenient resource of poetry often employed by the *trouvères*. This is probably such a case. A late example of the sort is shown in *Octavien*, a poem of the early fourteenth century, where the name is adopted for the sake of rhyme, and, together with the name, a mythical element added, applicable to any fabulous hero.[4]

Arthur is represented, in the poetry now being considered, as a ruler of various possessions. The *Tristan* of Béroul shows him reigning over England at the same time that Marc is King of Cornwall.[5] In *Girart de Roussillon* he is mentioned as Arthur of Cornwall who had fought aforetime in Burgundy.[6] The romance of Ipomedon makes Arthur king of France; and in the *Lai d'Havelok* he presents Denmark, one of his conquests, in fief to

[1] Cf. Meyer, *Alexandre le Grand* (Paris, 1886), Vol. II, p. 171, n. 2, and p. 216; *Roman de Renart* (ed. Martin, Strassburg, 1882–87), § XXIII, vss. 1425–26: "Jusqu' as bones qu' Artus les fit Est-il sire, si con il dist;" *Conqueste de Jérusalem* (ed. Hippeau, Paris, 1868), vss. 3739–40.

[2] Cf. *Aiol* (ed. Normand et Raynaud, Paris, 1877), vss. 935–37: "Cis est de la taverne trop tot issus; Che samble des cevaus le roi Artu: Ne peut consentir home que tout ne tut."

[3] Cf. *Aiol et Mirabel* (1878–82), n. to vs. 936: "Die Anspielung auf die Pferde Artus die niemanden an sich kommen liessen, kann ich nicht belegen. Einzelne chansons de geste kennen ähnliche Pferde." Cf. Stengel's *Ausgaben und Abhandlungen*, Vol. XXXIV, p. 79.

[4] Cf. *Octavien* (ed. Vollmöller, Heilbronn, 1883), vss. 2280–83: "Diex, come sont bien escler(u)iées, Ves, quel heaume et quel escu! Cis est de cheualiers Arthu, qui ocient quanqu' il atainent!

[5] Cf. *Romania*, Vol. XXXV (1906), pp. 497 ff., and *Roman de Ham* (ed. Michel), p. 225.

[6] Cf. *Gérard de Rossillon* (ed. Michel, Paris, 1856), p. 244, ll. 6, 7.

Hodulf.[1] It is only natural for the mediaeval romances to extend the realms of Arthur beyond the limits of his native island and his government over other peoples besides the Celts, inasmuch as Geoffrey of Monmouth had already given currency to this idea as early as the *Historia*. The purpose of the Welsh prelate was no doubt to keep pace with the known historical exploits of Alexander and Charlemagne, though at the risk of weakening Arthur's relation to his own people in their national unity.[2] One of the conditions of the propagation of the Arthur cult in romance during the Middle Ages was that this hero should represent not alone the successful defense of his own realm but the conquest of other lands as well.

The Arthur of French poetry, in contrast to the Arthur of Breton legends, is therefore a denationalized hero whose sway over many countries was required by the demands of mediaeval romance. In measuring up to the standard of world-heroes like Alexander and Charlemagne, Arthur had to forego his exclusive kingship of the restricted area occupied by the Celts and make himself a world ruler.

From a number of poems which are found in this period—the turning-point of the twelfth century—it may be shown that the interest in Arthur had grown so great as to call forth numerous protests from poets who sought a hearing for other matter than the Arthurian. A case is given of a *trouvère* who, weaving together the sheerest kind of fable out of his imagination, decries the, to him, mythical story of Arthur and his knights and sets up his own narrative as the solid truth.[3] The prologue of the *Chevalier au Cygne* states that the stories of the Round Table are but lies in contrast to the subject which the poet is about to unfold.[4] In a like manner, although at a somewhat later date than the poem just given, the prologue of *Richars li Biaus* names, in a lengthy

[1] Cf. *Lai d'Havelok* (ed. Michel, Paris 1833), vss. 601, 602.

[2] Cf. Alanus de Insulis, *Prophetia Angl.* (Frcfti, 1603), p. 22.

[3] Cf. *La Naissance du Chevalier au Cygne* (ed. Todd, *Publications of the Mod. Lang. Assn.*, 1889), vss. 3292–99: "Maintes foies avés mainte novele oïe De la cort roi Artu et de sa baronie; De Gavain son neveu et de sa compaignie Et des autres barons dont la fable est bastie. Ce fu fable d'Artu u ço fu faerie, Mais ce fu verités, nel mescreés vos mie, De ces .V. chevaliers et de lor compaignie."

[4] Cf. the edition of Hippeau, Paris, 1877, vss. 11 ff.

array, all the existing cycles of poetry so as to have it appear that they, all together, were not worth this one poem the author was inscribing; the Breton cycle heroes are included in one group, but for some reason, possibly because it had become so common a word, the name of Arthur does not occur among theirs.[1] Huon de Villeneuve in his revision of *Doon de Nanteuil* deplores the taste of his times which demanded subjects like *Audigier*, *Morgan*, and *Arthur* instead of the real and worthy poetry which he laments as neglected and forgotten.[2]

In several other poems derogatory allusions occur with reference to the name of Arthur, whether expressly or not it would be difficult to determine, inasmuch as the name happens in the verse without any particular motive.[3] In *Elie de Saint-Gille*, for example, the pagan king of Alexandria, when he first beholds Bernard of Brabant, unites, in one exclamation, Arthur and Gauvain and also Pilate from the nether world.[4] These few indications just given above, it should be said, are derived from passages in poems which have no essential bearing on the main theme of the poems and are to be considered, therefore, as only incidental. There are no such strange developments in French poetry with reference to the character of Arthur at this period (1200–1225) as are to be noted in German literature with this hero for subject. Certain episodes of *Diu Crône* make a curiously grotesque depiction of Arthur, who appears here to be a sort of *roi fainéant*, whereas the nephew of Arthur, Gauvain, as in the English romances, replaces his uncle as the hero of the poem.[5]

The belief that Arthur would return, although a popular idea fixed in certain localities, was not shared by the *trouvères* in the poetry now being examined; they all inclined to slight the notion in their works or to employ it in figurative expression as a synonym

[1] Cf. the edition of Foerster (Halle, 1874), vss. 1–32.

[2] Cf. *Romania*, Vol. XIII (1884), pp. 10 and 18.

[3] Cf. *Doon de Mayence* (Pey, 1859), vss. 2468–69; *Enfances Vivien* (ed. Wahlund und von Feilitzen, Upsala, 1895), vss. 2790–92: "si estes viex le poil avez chenu, bñ semblez or du tans le roi Artus, mal soit de l'arbre q' to iorz porte fruit."

[4] Cf. the edition of Raynaud (Paris, 1879), vss. 653–56 and p. 117, l. 3: "Dist Jossés d'Alixandre: 'Cis vieus est mervellous! C'est Artus de Bretaigne u Gavain, ses nevos, U Pilate d'enfer u Mordrant l'aïrous, Qui manguënt les homes .V. u .IIII. en .I. jor.'"

[5] Cf. the edition of Scholl (*Bibl. des Litt. Ver. Stuttgart*, Vol. XXVII, 1852), vss. 3365–70, 5081–90, 10613 ff.

for despair. Other heroes in poetry of the mediaeval period were expected to return in due time to reign again, Charlemagne and Ogier le Danois among the number. The reason the return of Arthur should have evoked, from very early date, the misgiving it did, in contrast to the acceptation which a similar belief met with in the case of other heroes, was not so much that Arthur, unlike them, was not to return, but rather that the Bretons had placed too much stress upon a local tradition no more worthy of respect than were similar myths connected with other heroes. It was the Bretons' zeal for their national hero. Near the end of the twelfth and through the course of the thirteenth century the same expressions occurred on this subject as were current before.[1]

In the numerous poems which mention Arthur, during the period under consideration, it is not difficult nor unreasonable to read into the references to this hero something more than a simple embellishment of verse or a device of rhyme. The common instances where Arthur is reputed to have once possessed a certain lance or sword, for example, are not intended as historical record by the poet, but as having purely romantic signification.[2] Such attributes or accessories of romance represent so many elements of fable growing around the name of a mythical personage.[3] In accordance with this tendency and as a result of its cumulative effect the fourteenth century went still farther in the same romantic direction. It may be that through the Celtic influences working upon the *chansons de geste* or in some other way not definitely ascertained the figure of Auberon appears in French poetry in

[1] Cf. *Garin le Loherain* (ed. P., Paris, 1833-35), Vol. I, p. 238, n. 2; and *Garin le Loherain* (ed. P., Paris, 1862), Liv. II, chap. xii, p. 100. Kressner, *Rustebuefs Gedichte, Lai de Brichemer*, vss. 15, 16: "Autel atente m'esteut fere Come li Breton font de lor roi"—reference to some acquaintance of Rustebuef who took a long time to fulfil his promises. *Philippe de Mouskés* (ed. Reiffenberg, Bruxelles, 1838), vss. 25207-8: "Mais Breton atendent folie, Quar Artus ne revenra mie." Cf. also Appel, *Provenzalische Inedita* (Leipzig, 1892), p. 194, ll. 10, 11.

[2] Cf. *Gérard de Rossillon*, p. 244, vss. 6-8: "Lo coms demanda espiet, Drogues loh baila Un que aportet Artus de Cornualha, Que ja fetz en Bergonha una batalha." Meyer, in his note to this passage, says that he knows of no such adventure as the one here mentioned; cf. his translation of this poem (Paris, 1884), p. 276, § 593. *Doon de Mayence*, vss. 8753-56: "Garin tint Finechamp: son pere li donna Quant le deluge fu, en terre souffossa; Meslin quand il vivoit, as Englois l'enseigna, Artus la tint maint jour qui souvent l'esprouva." *Anseis de Cartage* (ed. Alton, 1892), vss. 3057-59: "Rois Anseis, si baron et si dru Se desarmerent el palais o lambru En une cambre, ki fu del tens Artu." *Godefroi de Bouillon* (ed. de Reiffenberg, 1848), vss. 7571-72.

[3] Cf. *Aye d'Avignon* (ed. Guessard, 1861), vss. 3776-77; *Renaus de Montauban* (ed. Michelant, 1862), vss. 16723-24.

the thirteenth century.[1] With whatever care the early poets had differentiated the matters of France, Rome, and Britain it proved to be of little avail after Auberon, son of Julius Caesar and Morgan, sister of Arthur, had become identified with French epic poetry. The advent of Auberon represents the fusion of the matters of France, Rome, and Britain, but at the same time also it marks the epoch of dissolution of the entire body of epic poetry, preparing it for its conversion into prose form.

Following close upon the departure already made in *Huon de Bordeaux*, at the opening of the fourteenth century, in the romance of *Auberon*, Arthur and his sister are shown as spirited from Britain into the presence of Brunehaut at Rome. On the next day Arthur and his knights return to their land in the north as swiftly as they had come, the day before, leaving Morgan with Julius Caesar, to whom, as it seems from the narrative, she has been both betrothed and married in the space of one day.[2] The romance of *Esclarmonde* represents Huon and his wife wafted through the air to Monmur, the enchanted region of which Huon is recognized king by Auberon just previously to Auberon's death.

One of the conditions of the compact between Huon and Auberon was that the former should defend Monmur on St. John's day of each year against Arthur who laid claim to the land which Auberon had solemnly sworn that Arthur should never seize.[3]

One episode in the *Bastars de Buillon* has to do with an adventure into the realm of Artus li faés, who rules over a sort of Lotus-land in company with his sister Morgan on the remote shore of the Red Sea.[4] In *Brun de la Montagne*, a poem of the second half of the fourteenth century, Arthur has numerous magic territories attributed to him.[5]

[1] Cf. Nyrop, *Storia dell' epopea francese* (1885), p. 113, and note; *Huon de Bordeaux* (ed. Guessard, 1860), p. xx.

[2] Cf. A. Graf, *I Complementi della Chanson d'Huon de Bordeaux* (Halle, 1878), vss. 1259–1308: in this poem, it is to be noticed that Arthur is an old man, *Artu le roy chenu* (vs. 2234); usually there is no allusion to Arthur's age when he is mentioned in the poems. Cf. *Méliador* (ed. Longnon, Paris, 1895), vss. 4–6.

[3] Cf. *Esclarmonde* (ed. Schweigel, in Stengel's *Ausgaben und Abhandlungen*), LXXXIII, p. 126, and Schaefer, *ibid.*, XC, p. 102.

[4] Cf. the edition of Scheler (Bruxelles, 1877), vss. 3311–13 and 3552–55: "Atant es vous Artus, le noble conquérant, Richement couronné de couronne luisant, Deus fées gratieuses l'aloient adestrant, L'une fut sa soeur Morgue, qui à prisier fist tant."

[5] Cf. *Brun de la Montagne* (ed. Meyer, Paris, 1875), vss. 570 and 3237–39.

By making Arthur the center of a fairy world, late mediaeval poetry simply enhanced the romantic idea which had been received from the Breton cycle proper of Chrestien de Troyes and his immediate successors. In this cycle Arthur stands as a model of kingship overruling affairs in a world of reality. This personified ideal of social excellence, as it is portrayed, for example, in the romance of the *Chevalier as deus espées*, was developed from the martial Arthur of a preceding age by the same process which had transformed, by this time, the Arthur of the fourteenth century out of the Arthur of the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries.[1] Owing to the very meager historical nucleus represented in the career of Arthur, there has never been a time when his name did not have romantic elements attached to it. Yet it may be said, in general, that the heroic Arthur of legend evolved in the Middle Ages along the lines of development common to all heroes of romance—the fabulous element increasing at the expense of any historical data which may have existed in the beginning until nothing of the historical hero remained except the name.[2]

As a pendant to the subject of Arthur in the poetry of this period, the romance of the *Chevalier du Papegau* should be cited, though it is only a prose adaptation from a verse original.[3] It gives a lamentably distorted portrayal of the traditional Arthur of the twelfth-century poets. This story had for its original hero a knight by the name of Guiglois, and all the adventures which befell him in the poem are simply transferred to Arthur in the prose version. For instance, Arthur, upon receiving a wound in the face from Lion sans Mercy, is represented as returning the compliment, after both combatants were finally unhorsed, by hacking off the left arm of his adversary. This substitution of Arthur for the first hero, Guiglois, is, to use the words of the editor of the prose text, *ein ganz glücklicher Griff*, for the reason that Arthur was known in those days the world over as a great hero, yet no romance of the Round Table had ever made of him

[1] Cf. the edition of Foerster (Halle, 1877), vss. 1–50; *Du Mantel Mautaillié* (ed. Montaiglon, 1878), pp. 1–3.

[2] The Arthur of Chaucer, for instance, is not the Breton cycle hero but simply a myth of fairyland corresponding to this latest stage; cf. the edition of Skeat, Vol. V, pp. 313, 314, 374–76.

[3] Cf. the edition of Heuckenkamp (Halle, 1896), p. xxx.

a fighting monarch. There can be no doubt, of course, that the inventiveness of the adaptor of the prose *Papegau* must have pleased immensely those readers of the fourteenth century who had tired of the traditional Arthur. None the less, this story is a weird disfigurement.

During the troubled period of the Hundred Years' War, the memory of the ancient heroes was revived by the poets, and especially by Deschamps, who strove to inspire in his generation a courage like that of the old days.[1] Alexander, who in all mediaeval romance had been the pattern of *largesce*, became in these later times renowned for valor and emprise, in keeping with his original historic character. Arthur is mentioned as one of the *Neuf Preux* in the company of the other worthies of Christendom; Deschamps included Du Guesclin, who had just died, as worthy to join Arthur's number, making Du Guesclin the tenth champion.[2] In the same warlike spirit, Philippe de Mézières employs the names of Arthur and Charlemagne, urging the kings of England and France to wage war upon their common enemy the infidels.[3] Thus, the ideal of the militant Arthur of early Breton tradition was reinstated during the period of Du Guesclin and Jeanne Darc in order to rekindle a fighting spirit.

Out of the foregoing data from the metrical romances of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries some idea may be gained of the fiction elements that have to do with Arthur among the French *trouvères* of that period. In order to furnish an adequate survey of the subject in its manifold phases it would be necessary to give the outline of a poetic history of Arthur similar in idea to the notable contribution to mediaeval herology by Paris on Charlemagne.[4]

F. L. CRITCHLOW

PRINCETON, N. J.

[1] Cf. the edition of Saint-Hilaire and Raynaud (Paris, 1882), Vol. III, pp. 265, 266.

[2] Cf. Deschamps, *ibid.*, Vol. X, p. xxxvii. *Chevalier au Cygne* (ed. Reiffenberg, Bruxelles, 1846), vss. 22110–14. *Hugues Capet* (ed. La Grange, Paris, 1864), vss. 2905–8: "Je croy que sa proësche doit estre comparée Deseure tous les preus dont on fait devisée: Alixandre ly rois, li sire de Caldée, Ne Artus de Bertaigne n'y vallurent rien née." *Chronique de Philippe de Mouskés* (ed. Reiffenberg, Bruxelles, 1838), vss. 24553–62: "Et saciés que puis qu' Alixandres Regna très Grèse jusqu'en Flandres, Ne puis qu' Artus France conquist, C'on nommait Galle si c'on dist, Ne Julius-Cézar regna, Ki mainte tière gaëgna, Ne Augustes-Cézar, ses niés, De qui les estores teniés, Ne Cloëvis ne Carlemainne, Qui tant conquist à son demainne."

[3] Cf. the edition of Jorga, *Bibl. de l'École des Hautes-Études*, Vol. CX (1896), p. 487.

[4] Cf. G. Paris, *Histoire poëtique de Charlemagne* (Paris, 1865 and 1905).

A GUIDE FOR THE BLIND[1]

For a good many years past we have been treated to popular science, but until comparatively recently popular scholarship has been spared us. Time was when only the scholar could consult "sources," but now-a-days democracy demands equal privileges for everybody, in scholarship as in politics and society. If the would-be investigator cannot go to the "sources," then the "sources" must be brought to him. This style of work having become fashionable, it is of interest to see how it may be done, and inasmuch as the recent facsimile reproduction of *The Old Yellow Book* of Browning, "with translation, essay, and notes," bears the *imprimatur* of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, one of the learned institutions of the world, it is no doubt fair to take it as a type of the best work of its class, and to suppose that an examination of its merits may throw some light upon the whole realm of literature to which it belongs.

No doubt we shall all agree that such translations, as intended not for the scholar but for the "general reader," should be clear in language, accurate in rendering, and adequate and exhaustive in the presentation of materials. The man who needs the translation has not the knowledge to serve as a check upon the translator. He puts himself unreservedly under guidance and trusts to his *cicerone*—a faithless class too, *ciceroni*—not to lead him astray or furnish him with spurious information. Unless the guide be qualified for his position, the most zealous of the personally conducted through the fields of erudition will acquire from his excursion but a confusion of distorted, inaccurate, utterly unscientific notions.

Unfortunately the accredited expositor has in this instance brought to his task a quite uncommon ignorance of the three languages that might have been helpful to him and his readers.

[1] *The Old Yellow Book*, source of Browning's "The Ring and the Book," in complete photo-reproduction with translation, essay, and notes, by Charles W. Hodell; cclxii+345 pp. Carnegie Institution of Washington, July, 1908.

His Latin may be gauged by his translation of *toto coelo*, "in the face of all heaven" (p. 96), or *operae pretium ducere*, as "pay down the price of toil" (p. 50); his Italian by his rendering of *volto a dire*, as "I turn back to say" (p. 76); his English by such a sentence as "Browning uniformly locates the home on the Via Paolina" (p. 318). Indeed his characterization of the language of the lawyers' pleas as "inaccurate grammatically, amorphous rhetorically, and utterly without the lift which a lawyer with good command of language should give to the treatment of a technical subject" is so admirable a description of his own translation that one can forgive the slight injustice that it does Arcangeli and Bottini. Beyond a doubt the Latinity of the ecclesiastical courts in the year of grace 1698 was somewhat barbarous—"No Tully, Ulpian at the best"—but it would need an added infusion of Boeotianism to find adequate transcription into such English as "We believe we have sufficiently canvassed these matters with galloping pen because of the shortness of the time of merely three hours" (p. 133), or "For Pompilia to show herself at her window at the hiss of her lover does not savor well" (p. 92).

At its best the translation of the vernacular pamphlets is highly Italianate. At its worst it bears little relation to the original. Everywhere it teems with sins, negligences, and ignorances. "I forbear to respond to what the Anonymous Writer has tried to have believed to the praise of Abate Paolo Franceschini, to excite greatly our pity" (p. 183). Such is the translation when it is accurate. Mrs. Plornish, we all remember, attained such celebrity by addressing Signor Baptista, "Me ope you leg well soon," that it was considered a very short remove from speaking Italian, and if the general reader, who was the object of the translator's amiable intentions, entertains this same theory of the relationship of tongues, he may perhaps be satisfied with the translation. In a translation he may fail to be startled by the violence of such a metaphor as "tear our house to tatters," p. 73 (*lacerino la nostra casa*). Perhaps—in a translation—he may consider "The execution of poor Signor Guido has taken place, with the loss of his head" (p. 190) merely a neat circum-

locution. He may admit that Pompilia acted "entirely by mere instigation" (p. 76). He may regretfully allow that "her matronly shame had been tampered with" (p. 94). It may seem entirely natural, in translator's English, that Pompilia's recourse to her supposititious parents should be described as "going back to the pity of the Comparini," p. 174 (*ricorrere alla pietà di dd. conjugi Comparini*). Captious criticism shall not assail "Pietro Comparini was supplied with plenty of money from the full hand of some unknown person," p. 121 (*Pietro Comparini abbondante di danaro somministratoli con larga mano da persona ignota*). Compassion shall be "living," p. 173 (*viva*), Violante shall be "imbued with Guido's flatteries and endearments" (p. 170), Caponsacchi's lay dress shall be stigmatized as "improper clothes" (p. 148), Pompilia's alleged conduct shall be called "dishonest," p. 153 (*inhonesta*). All this jargon the reader for whose use translations are prepared will accept naturally. Moreover, the piquancy of the narrative will carry him through passages like the following:

> And all that is being reported that a driver testifies that he had seen them kissing along the road has no legal foundation. For it rests merely on the word of a single witness of the lowest class, and he swears to matters that are quite improbable, because he had to drive the carriage with such rapidity as that with which the fugitives were following their journey. Hence it was almost impossible for him to look backward, or to see what they were doing inside of that covered carriage. And this is all the more so because his deposition is vague, nor does it specify whether the kisses were given at night or by day. But his deposition is rendered much more doubtful and improbable because, in such a swift journey as the carriage was making, it might chance during the jolting of it that the accident of their faces meeting casually would arise, and to him this might seem the act of kissing. This happens very commonly, even when one is making no such journey, according to the quality of the road and the rough ways which one finds (p. 179).

To dimly suspected inaccuracy, to occasional obscurity, to tormented language, to well-meant attempts to minimize the differences made at the Tower of Babel, the reader of translations will show a resigned, perhaps a cheerful, complaisance, but unless he has learned from Mr. Henry James or Mrs. Eddy that oracles

speak always in riddles, will he not misdoubt his guide when he comes upon such a passage as this: "But this shall never be, even if there do not follow both love and concord. I will never advise that," p. 89 (*Questo non sarà mai vero, se pure non seguisse d'amore, e d'accordo; ma io non ce li consigliarò*). Or: "In the Court many a time I exaggerated the excess of her supposed conception," p. 107 (*essagerai più volte nel Tribunali l'eccesso del Parto supposto*).

Will not such utterances convince the uninitiated that "sources" are indeed strange and wonderful? The slight residue of obscurity in "The Ring and the Book" will become quite intelligible, the murkiness and turbidity of its source being considered. Browning will seem for once to have clarified, and not to have clouded. In apparent contradiction to his alleged predilection for befogging the clear and involving the simple, he will seem in this case to have found a limpid narrative, a fluent argument, where to the bewildered vision of the reader of the translation only turbidity and confusion and obscurity resided.

For the vindication of Browning from the frequent charge of wilful obscurity, such an impression perhaps ought to receive encouragement, but whether it is in consonance with the facts is decidedly open to question. Perhaps we cannot demand of the translator that his translation affect the reader as the originals affected their several circles of readers in the year 1698. The scholastic subtleties of the lawyers, their casuistical logic, their pedantic array of authorities, will not touch the intellect even of the jurisprudents of our generation, as they did the auditors of the Papal Camera in the seventeenth century. The popular pamphlets cannot again evoke the interest that they did when Guido and his four companions were lying in prison, their fate still undecided, and all the tongues of Rome wagging about them pro or con as only Italian tongues can wag. Only on the supposition that they were accompanied by a potent love philter, can even the most sentimental of our generation understand the alleged emotional effects of the love letters. The old tragedy may be brought again upon the boards, but to us the actors are puppets, and not *personaggi* as they were to the spectators of two hundred years ago.

We cannot be made to feel as the Romans of that day felt, but it is not too much to demand that this translation of the actors' parts make upon us, within measure, the same impression that the originals produced upon at least one man of our own time, to-wit, Browning. It is not inconceivable that Browning might have written his "Agamemnon" with only Professor Verrall's translation before him. It is safe to say that, with all his love of the recondite, the obscure, the bizarre, with all his carelessness of form, with all his avidity for *causes célèbres*, he would never have seen the visions that he saw that June night on the terrace above Felice church, if the Hand always above his shoulder had placed before him this English translation of *The Old Yellow Book*.

The *parto supposto* of the last quotation, in both its Italian and its Latin form, has led the translator into strange and fantastic liberties with his mother tongue. Being untrammeled by Flaubertesque scruples as to diction, he is free to endeavor by various shots to hit the mark. The "excess of her supposed conception" (p. 107) is perhaps the wildest shot. More often we hear of "Pompilia's pretended birth" (p. 153), or "the pretense of birth" (p. 164), or "the supposed birth" (p. 154), or "the falsity of the birth" (p. 50). Or, we read: "The said Francesca Pompilia was not their daughter, but was of a false birth" (p. 172). Again: "After a pretense of her birth had been made, she had been received and brought up by them" (p. 50). Under whatever variant forms the phrase appears, it is calculated to enhance the extraordinary character of the adoptive mother's confession to the Grand Penitentiary.

Jargon and cryptic utterance may perhaps pass muster in a translation, but the reader will be more simple than gentle if he is not sometimes conscious of a distinct break in the argument, whether it be in the direct narrative of the Italian or in the elaborate periods of the Latin. For example, Pompilia in her deposition, speaking of her husband's unreasoning jealousy, relates that he accused her of remaining upon the "balcony"—so *loggia* is translated—"in order to make love," and that she defended herself against the charge by pointing out that she could not look into the windows of the neighboring house, "for the balcony was

only as high as our heads" (p. 70). "A very extraordinary balcony, that of the Franceschini palace," the reader curious of architectural detail is bound to reflect. Even granting, however, such an odd excrescence upon the Aretine palace, he will wonder why it conclusively prevented a glimpse into neighboring windows. At this point a smattering of Italian might help him. *Perche soprastava d. loggia alli Tetti solamente*, runs the Italian. This *loggia* up above the neighboring roofs will appear a perfectly familiar feature of Tuscan domestic architecture, and moreover its situation will explain the absurdity of Guido's suspicions. Can it be that a professional translator has mistaken the second *t* in *tetti* for the long *s* in *teste*, and so translated *roofs* "heads," with a truly English contempt for the foolish conventions of grammatical gender.

Another passage, this one from the Latin, which interrupts in a similar way the argument, may serve to confirm the suspicion. "The assembling of armed men" (*coadunatio armatorum*) for any purpose was forbidden in Rome, but it appears that some distinction of penalty was made between an assemblage *ad malum finem* and an assemblage *ad bonum finem*. Our translator renders *ad malum finem* properly enough "for an evil end," but to the demolition of the argument translates *ad bonum finem*, "in good faith" (p. 155), again despising servility to the letter and transcending the bounds of a purely arbitrary gender.

To multiply examples of this sort of inaccuracy which sometimes muddles and sometimes distorts the meaning of the context, would be an easy but a tedious task. *Laetalia vulnera eidem inferat*, "inflicts wounds unhesitatingly upon her" (p. 65), which is a rather ingenious translation if one derives *laetalia* from the same root as *laetus; Sacro Testo*, "Sacred Witness" (p. 124), which to a Protestant unversed in Catholic phraseology might seem a not unduly odd epithet for the Holy Scriptures; *cameriero* "chambermaid" (p. 75), which may be intended as a translation of an unknown into a known custom, rather than of an unknown into a known tongue—may suffice to illustrate this phase of the translator's shortcomings as a guide to the monoglot reader, although pp. 163 and 177 may be referred to for specimens of

particularly inconsequent argument. But in the words of our translator, "I pass over responding to the many other improprieties, which have been advanced uselessly and without any point by the said Writer" (p. 183).

Of the style of the translations from the Latin I will therefore not speak, though had the Harvard freshman perpetrated such a version of Cicero, it is safe to say it would have brought the luckless youth once more into scandalous notoriety. Quite apart from the translator's inadequate knowledge of the foreign and maladroit handling of his own language, he has proceeded upon a theory of translation which only the nicest sense of linguistic values and the most acute perception of the logical trend of an argument could put into successful execution. To reduce them to "intelligible English idiom," the Latin periods have been "broken up" (p. 4). As a result, for the elaborate but closely compact Latin structure, we have a simple but disjointed English sentence arrangement, in which very generally the logical emphasis of the original has been shifted. The structural relations of the idea are distorted. In the process of splitting up the sentence the subordinate becomes co-ordinate only to the injury of the logical proportions. When relative clauses, ablative absolutes, even interjected illustrations, become independent sentences, the principal clause runs some risk of losing not only its grammatical but also its logical supremacy. So it happens that in many paragraphs of this translation there seem to be many members but no head, many statements but no argument. Professor Hodell's theory of translation is too delicate an instrument to be placed in ordinary hands.

The entire critical apparatus bound up with the Book is avowedly designed for the elucidation of the "source problem" (p. 294). Now indubitably one of the points upon which Browning's readers will most desire to have light is the source of the canonistic lore in the lawyers' speeches and the origin of such passages as

> Cornelia de Sicariis hurried to help
> Pompeia de Parricidiis; Julia de
> Something-or-other jostled Lex this-and-that;

and it is on precisely these points that those who read the Latin pleas will receive most enlightenment:

Magnum quidem facinus, sed maximopere commiserandum, & excusatione dignissimum, cui saeverissimae leges indulgent, & mitissimè se gerunt erga Maritos notam Infamiae delentes sanguine adulterarum Uxorum *l. Si Adulterium cum incastu 38* § *.Imperatores ff. ad leg. Jul. de Adulter. l. Marito 24. ff. eod. leg. Gracchus C. eod. leg. 1.* § *.Fin. ff. ad leg. Cornel. de Sycar. l. Si quis in gravi 3.* § *.Si tamen Maritus ff. ad Syllan. clar.* § *.Homicidium. num. 49. Giurb. cons. 86. num. 9. Berlich. pract. conclus.* § *.4. conclus. 27. num. 152. Caball. resol. crim. cas. 300. num. 5. Farinacc. quaest. 121. num. 63.* Quod idem sancitum fuerat in legibus Athaeniensium, & solonis, hoc est sapientissimorum Legislatorum, & quod magis est in illo rudi saeculo Romuli *leg.* 15. ibi— *Adulterii convictam vir, & Cognati uti volent necanto*—ut refert ibi *Balduin. Piccard. in* § *.Item lex Julia de Adulteriis num. 3. Instit. de public. Judic.*, & similiter in *legibus 12. Tabul.*, ut refert *Aul. Gell. noct. Act. lib. 10. cap. 23. Tiraquell. ad leg. Connub. 15. num. 13. Covar. in Epitom. Decretal. lib. 4. part. 2. cap. 7.* § *.7. in princ. & num. i., Ameseva de potest. in se ipsum cap. 13. num. 12. in fin., Matthae. de re crim. controv. 11. num. 8.* (p. x).

So early as the second page of the Book one thus finds the key to much that is curious in "The Ring and the Book." So much for "those readers of Browning who are conversant with Italian and Latin." What of "the rest of his public" (p. 4), those for whom the translation has been provided? This is the version that they get:

Great indeed is this crime, but very greatly to be pitied also, and most worthy of excuse. Even the most severe laws give indulgence and are very mild toward husbands who wipe out the stain of their infamy with the blood of their adulterous wives. [Citations.] This indeed was sanctioned in the laws of the Athenians and of Solon (that is, of the wisest of legislators), and what is more, even in the rude age of Romulus, law 15, where we read: "A man and his relatives may kill as they wish a wife convicted of adultery." [Citations.]

"Citations" will throw little light upon

> The Athenian Code,
> Solon's, the name is serviceable,—then,
> The Laws of the Twelve Tables, that Fifteenth,—
> "Romulus" likewise rolls out round and large;
> The Julian; the Cornelian; Gracchus' Law.

Yet the names thus summarily lumped together would explain every allusion here made besides such lines as

> See "De Re
> Criminali," in Matthaeus' divine piece,

or

> Our Farinacci, our Gamaliel erst,
> In those immortal "Questions."

This habit of omission, designed no doubt to simplify the text and therefore to be helpful to the reader, becomes at times an embarrassment and source of perplexity, as when we read "according to the prescript of the Bull" (p. 35), no Bull having previously been referred to, or "a text in the law of Emperor Hadrian" (p. 25), as though the great patron of Salvius Julianus and forerunner of Justinian had made but one contribution to the code. The Latin runs in one case "*ex praescripto Bullae Reformationis san. mem. Pauli V.* § *.10. n. 3.;*" in the other "*Textus in leg. Div. Adrianus ff. ad leg. Pomp. de Parricid.*" The translator being accustomed to a short and easy method of dealing with "Citations" curtails them unduly even in passages like these, in which as integral parts of the text they exact of him a somewhat less summary treatment. As if to compensate, however, for his drastic suppression of the legal documentation, he exercises the utmost care to give chapter and verse of biblical quotations and is at pains to indicate that

Heu fuge crudeles terras, fuge littus avarum,

is from "Verg., *Aen.*, iii, 44" (p. 173), an interesting fact of which the reader of the Italian original will be left in ignorance.

The whole matter of proper names, indeed, is a vague and perplexed one to our translator. Whether to let his jurisconsults and other authorities wear their Latin or their vernacular names, is a question about which his judgment is continually vacillating. The great lawyer of the Cenci trial appears now as Farinacci, now as Farinaccius. Chasseneux appears under his Latin name on the same page with Soccini; Farinacci and Raynaldus appear together in the same sentence (p. 85). Sometimes we have the

Latin form of the name, as "Marsilius," sometimes the Italian, as "Sanzio," sometimes the English, as "Ulpian," and sometimes, shall we say, the Esperanto, as "St. Hilario" (p. 169). Take the form "Hilario." It is not the Latin Hilarius, nor the Italian Ilario, nor yet the English Hilary, nor even the French Hilaire. Yet one conversant with any one of the four languages would recognize what is meant; and is not precisely this the specific quality of Esperanto?

The same might be said of the curious names under which the jurists Pellegrini and Matteo d'Afflitto appear. By all the laws of assimilation that obtain in the Italian tongue "Peregrini" (p. 192) and "Afflicti" (p. 30) are condemned as aliens, nor do I know in which of the Romance commonwealths they can claim citizenship, unless it be in the one which like themselves has come into being by autocratic fiat.

In still odder guise appear two famous Milanese. Aegidius Bossius would hardly recognize himself under the exotic appellation of "Boss" (p. 193), and we may assert with confidence that in all these five hundred years and more Gian Galeazzo Visconti has never before figured as "Galeatius, Viscount of Mediolanum" (p. 64).

Whether it is desirable or undesirable to translate proper names of men or places may be a subject for academic discussion, but it is not too much to ask that a translator make up his mind on the question beforehand and then hold to his theory consistently, at least in the course of one piece of work. Variety may be artistic, but it is not scientific. If we have Farinacci in a work of scientific scholarship, then we have a right to expect Ciriaco, and not Cyriacus, or if Mediolanum is the form that appeals to the translator, then Arretium and Florentia and Neapolis must follow. Can we, however, expect systematic precision of nomenclature from a guide whom no scruples of language or geography deter from translating *episcopo Tornacensi*, "the bishop of Tornacensis" (p. 27), or *in Senatu Matritensi*, "in the senate of Matritensis" (p. 17)?

One other indictment on the score of proper names must be entered: often the form, though not necessarily incorrect, is mis-

leading. "Gratian," if it suggests anything to the average English reader, brings to mind the unfortunate son of Valentinian, who is *not* meant, and not the twelfth-century Bolognese monk of Santi Felice e Nabore, who *is* meant. If the reader is familiar with the history of canon law, he probably needs no translation; if he is not, "Gratian" will mislead him, as "Gratianus" or "Graziano" would not do, since these unfamiliar forms would at once apprise him of his ignorance.

Or take: "Calvin gives other cases so decided [Citations]" (p. 15). It is startling to hear the great heresiarch thus adduced as authority in a papal court, for it is the Genevese reformer and nobody else that the name Calvin inevitably connotes to the American Protestant mind. Among us it is he who possesses a kind of prescriptive right to the name, and in any case it may well be doubted whether a German jurist, *né* Kahl, and masquerading in learned circles as Calvinus, has any claim to dispute it with him. The reader who has no special knowledge to check the translation is bound to get an erroneous impression.

Upon such an inconsistency as the use in the same paragraph (p. 132) of the two forms "Ecclesiastical State" and "Ecclesiastic State" to designate that portion of Italian territory generally known as the States of the Church, or upon the idiosyncrasy of spelling *kingdom* with a small *k* though the Kingdom of Naples is referred to (p. 23), perhaps only a meticulous criticism would insist. It is not, however, too much to demand that an accredited interpreter of pamphlets "in the Apostolic Chamber's type" should be aware that a *congregatio* is not a "special sitting" (p. 121); that to render *in causis tam beneficialibus, quam profanis*, "in causes philanthropic or profane" (p. 133) is neither technically nor substantially correct; that *domus pro carcere*, the "technical designation of the home of the Comparini" which "is found in the decree of transfer and is often repeated throughout the Book" (p. 317), was not employed for the first time in this case.

Again, when one reads of "Judge A. C. Tommati" (p. 315), it is difficult to resist the impression that the translator believes the prefixed letters to indicate the prelate's baptismal names, and one

can but regret that Tommati did not happen to be the *Uditore del A. C. met.*, that we might have seen under what grotesque guise his name would then have appeared. But conceding the utmost to a learned man—though appearances are against him—and granting that he knows that A. C. stands for *Auditor Camerae*, ought he not of his learning to assist the unlettered reader to a proper understanding of the letters, instead of lulling him into the belief that they represent something familiar?

In the face, however, of the translator's rendering *tres Auditores Sacrae Rotae*, "three students of the Sacred Law" (p. 112), it is a strain upon charity to concede him any knowledge about Auditors or indeed about any part of the papal system of administration. "Sacred Court," though in itself distressing as a translation of *Sacra Rota*, becomes quite tolerable after one discovers how wide the limits of variation from the original may be. As *Rota* is a term which occurs in "The Ring and the Book," as well as in the Book, it would seem that our translator ought to have explained its meaning to us, as he amiably explains the meaning of Scylla and Charybdis. Possibly, however, the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, the apparent source of the latter bit of erudition, failed him under the title "Rota."

And this brings us to the subject of the "corpus of topical notes," where, perhaps it is needless to say, the same unscientific lack of system—symptomatic, shall we say, of "turbid heads" (p. 69)—prevails as in the translation. The announcement is explicitly made that "the annotation has been confined to the source problem" (p. 294). Yet many points that are raised both by the Book and by "The Ring and the Book" are left without explanation, while some quite irrelevant matter has been introduced. For instance, we look in vain for any account of the Roman judicial system or method of legal procedure, but we find a long discussion of the authority for the Formosus story, who, be he who he may, from Luitprand to Fleury, was certainly not one of the lawyers or pamphleteers of *The Old Yellow Book*. On technical terms the notes are almost uniformly unsatisfactory, and under "*luogo di monte*" it is difficult to accept a definition, untranslated, from an Italian dictionary, as an

adequate discussion of one of the great institutions of papal financial administration.

On the other hand, the editor has shown praiseworthy activity in indicating Browning's verbal and structural dependence upon his source. He has inserted some interesting information about the Franceschini family, and searched the registers of San Lorenzo in Lucina for Pompilia's birth, marriage, and death records.

Matthew Arnold, in his strictures upon this American life of ours, never spoke more truly than when he suggested there might be some defect in our perception of *whatsoever things are elevated.* How far this may be due to our education already tending to assume the form that President G. Stanley Hall recommends for the education of women, is an interesting question. The famous rule of President Hall is "to keep nothing that is not to become practical; to open no brain tracts which are not to be highways for the daily traffic of thought and conduct; not to overburden the soul with the impedimenta of libraries and records of what is afar off in time or zest." Is not such an education as this to shut one up in his own time, his own language, his own country, his own stratum of society, to make him blind to the beauty of antiquity, deaf to the magic incantations of the Middle Age, impervious to the spirit of other climes and other customs? If his education has ignored the imagination, narrowed the sympathies, confined the range of curiosity, will any amount of conscientious effort and willing service enable him afterward to pass beyond his own *milieu*, to feel and to communicate the atmosphere of a foreign country, a remote epoch, a strange religion?

However this may be, in translation, essay, and notes alike, the editor of *The Old Yellow Book* betrays a curious remoteness from his subject. In Catholic Italy he is quite *dépaysé.* For him the pope is "the crown of the institutional church of his day" (p. 270); the *compunzione*, in the throes of which mediaeval Italy became the mother of mystics and of saints, becomes in Pompilia "Christian tenderness" (p. 138); the grim old Aretine palace in which Pietro and Violante had suffered every privation and insult remains still to the American mind the "home"—returning one night they find themselves "locked out of the

home" (p. 171). No man who has ever walked the galleries of Italy with joy and seen the majestic figures of the heroine of Bethuel which the art of every age has placed upon the walls could have described her thus: "Judith, who was an entirely chaste widow, of decorous appearance and fine looking in many ways," p. 91 (*Juditham castissimam Viduam decora facie, & undique ornatam*).

For the idyllic grace of maternal love in Browning's Pompilia, we have the fatuous sentimentalism of "Pompilia's mother yearning" (p. 296), "the little Gaetano" (p. 283). For the compressed dignity of the Latin *angustia rei familiaris*, we have the crude concreteness of "the meagerness of the home comforts" (p. 184). The cheap religiosity of such phrases as "a true Christian hero" (p. 287), "the spirit of self-sacrificial love, which is the essence of Christianity" (p. 288); the pert crudeness of "the resurrected story" (p. 290); the indulgent Protestantism of "an embodied Madonna" (289); the up-to-date tang of "Claudius Jr." (p. 23) for *Claudius filius* or "Modestinus, Doctor of Law" (p. 25) for *Modestinus, Juris Consultus;* the general grotesqueness of diction as shown in the employment of words like "forbear," "chippy," "raised" in the sense of *reared;* the ostentatious employment of words only half understood, like *genre* and *macrocosm* (pp. 290, 291)—are not all of these typical of the lack of elevation, the lack of distinction, the lack of cultivation, which obtains too much among us even in academic circles where "culture" is a profession? Not once in this study of a noble poem are we lifted into the spiritual empyrean. Not once in this tale of seventeenth-century Italy do we breathe any air but that of twentieth-century America. Is it unfair to wonder whether such a work can be of aid to any form of scholarship, be it popular or otherwise?

In conclusion, however, it should be said that whatever the value of the critical apparatus appended to the work, the Carnegie Institution has rendered a notable service to real scholarship in reproducing *The Old Yellow Book.* The Book, reposing in its glass case in the Balliol College library and existing so far as was known in a unique exemplar, was practically as inaccessible

as the "dogseared Spicilegium" or the "vulgarized Horace" that flanked it once in the Piazza San Lorenzo.

Having the Book we shall no longer hear from one critic that Bottinius' monologue is "too preposterous in its vigorous blackening of his client, Pompilia's character," nor from another the ardent rejoinder that "there does exist in every great controversy a class of more or less official partizans who are engaged in defending each cause by entirely inappropriate arguments." The pleas of the lawyers pro and con, which are found in full in the Book, prove once more the reality of the improbable and the folly of over-subtle exegesis. Bottinius, who at first blush seems to hold a thread of discourse as wildly improbable as Mrs. Nickleby or Flora Finching, appears in the Book quite as in "The Ring and the Book," with his literary allusions, his pedantic casuistry, his utterly and, apparently, consciously futile arguments, his frank admission of the possibility of his client's guilt. Browning never was a caricaturist; the publication of the Book vindicates him even in the hitherto doubtful case of Bottinius.

The possession of the Book settles also such questions as why Browning introduced such "a cramp of Latin," told trifling, prosaic, irrelevant tales, and adduced all sorts of legal authorities with names never before heard in the poetry of any tongue. We know now that he did it for the very simple reason that all these things were in his original. "*Sfrisiandum*," vocable unknown to Du Cange; the Smyrnean woman; Farinaccius, Butringarius, Castrensis, and their *confrères;* the pseudo-saying of our Lord, *Honorem meum nemini dabo;* there they all are; Browning did but speak by the Book.

Even the form which Browning chose for his masterpiece will no longer afford matter for discussion. That, too, is found to have been suggested, if not determined, by the source. Not only do the procurators and the advocates present plea, proof, and information; not only are the depositions of Caponsacchi and Pompilia presented in the summaries; not only have we a file of the forged love-letters, which, it may be said parenthetically, appear to belong to cryptic rather than erotic literature; but in two anonymous pamphlets in the collection, written and circulated

in the interests of Guido and Pompilia respectively, appear the unmistakable lineaments of Half-Rome and The Other Half-Rome. Exegetical, psychological, antiquarian points, raised by "The Ring and the Book," are illuminated by a flood of light now that its source is known.

LOUISE FAGAN PEIRCE

GAMBIER, OHIO

DESCHAMPS' "THUIREVAL"

In a ballade of five stanzas and an envoy, Deschamps champions the cause of the Leaf as opposed to the Flower, and in the envoy cites a number of distinguished Frenchmen who hold with the Leaf.

> Royne sur fleurs en vertu demourant,
> Galoys d'Aunoy, Mornay, Pierre ensement
> De Tremöille, li borgnes Porquerons,
> Et d'Araynes Lyonnet vont loant,
> Et Thuireval vostre bien qui est grant;
> Pour ce a feuille plus qu'a fleur nous tenons.[1]

Again, in the envoy of a ballade addressed to the Seneschal d'Eu, the main author of the *Livre des Cent Ballades*, he mentions other French courtiers whom the Seneschal is to consult if he is in doubt as to the answer of the question that has been propounded to him.[2]

> Seneschal d'Eu, mes cuers en vous se fie,
> Enquerez bien de ceste maladie
> Au Tourangoys, a Le Breth et au fort
> Au conte d'Eu, Harecourt, Jehan de Trie,
> Et pour estre mieulx la chose fournie,
> Demandez ent a l'amoureux Cliffort.

These various names are identified by Raynaud in his index to Deschamps,[3] and Professor Kittredge in his interesting account of the last-named courtier, Sir Lewis Clifford, has touched upon them.[4] Neither Raynaud nor Kittredge, however, has been able to identify "Thuireval." Under this name Raynaud has in his index

[1] *Œuvres complètes d'Eustache Deschamps* (*S. A. T. F.*), IV, pp. 262–64.

[2] Lequel vault mieulx a jeune chevalier
Et a homme qui par le monde va,
Belle dame, s'il se veult marier,
Qui jeune soit, ou moyenne qui a
L'aage passé? Et laquelle prendra
Pour le meilleur et pour joieuse vie
Le chevalier?
—*Ibid.*, III, pp. 375, 376.

[3] See Vol. X (*S. A. T. F.*), *Index des noms propres et des matières* under the names "Aunoy," "Mornay," "La Trémouille," "Poquières," "Araynes," "Orléans (Louis d')," "Albret (Charles d')," "Artois (Philippe d')," "Harcourt (Jean VI)," "Trie (Jean de)," "Clifford."

[4] "Chaucer and Some of His Friends," *Modern Philology*, I, 1.

merely "membre de l'Ordre de la *Feuille*," which is nothing more than a repetition of what Deschamps had already said, and Kittredge says, "Thuireval has not been identified."[1]

There exists, nevertheless, evidence which seems to show that Thuireval, like Clifford, was an English knight, perhaps a friend of Clifford's; and also, that in at least one instance he may have been connected with Chaucer in a rather remote manner. Chaucer on October 15, 1386, in the refectory of the abbey at Westminster, deposed before John de Derwentwater in the Scrope and Grosvenor controversy that he was "del age de xl ans & plus armeez par xxvij ans,"[2] thus giving us the main evidence upon which the date of his birth rests. Sir Lewis Clifford was also one of the deponents in the same controversy, and also upon the side of Scrope. His testimony was given four days after Chaucer's (October 19, 1386), in the same place, and before the same commissioner;[3] and was preceded by that of John Thirlewalle, who is in all probability the "Thuireval" of Deschamps' ballade. The slight variation in the orthography would not hinder the identification.[4] His deposition was one of the most interesting of the many that were given in that long trial over the right to the arms azure a bend d'or, and contained several rather remarkable statements concerning the age of his father.[5]

From it we learn that Thirlewalle was the youngest of several brothers; that according to his own statement he was fifty-four years old in October, 1386, and had been armed for thirty-two years and upward, which would place his birth in the years 1331–32 and would make him about twenty-two or younger when he first took up arms.[6] The usual age at which men were armed in those days was fifteen or sixteen, but it was not unheard of for

[1] *Modern Philology*, I, 5, n. 6.

[2] Nicolas, *Scrope and Grosvenor Controversy*, I, 178. [3] *Ibid.*, I, 183.

[4] Cf. the many variants of the name Chaucer (Kern, *The Ancestry of Chaucer*, p. 10) or those of Clanvowe (Kittredge, *Modern Philology*, I, 15, n. 4).

[5] Nicolas, *Scrope and Grosvenor Controversy*, I, 181; II, 425.

[6] There have been many wild and whirling guesses made as to the meaning of *armeez* and the value of *plus* in the *Roll* (cf. Schmitz, *Poems of Geoffrey Chaucer Modernized*, London, 1841, p. cxiii; Shaw, *Complete Manual of English Literature*, New York, 1871, p. 37; Thoms, *Notes and Queries*, 4 S., VII, pp. 338, 478), but an examination of their use in the *Roll*, the details of which cannot be given here, proves conclusively that *armeez* refers to the number of years during which the deponent has borne arms. *Plus* was a variable quantity whose exact value cannot be determined; it usually represented a small number.

them to take up arms at the age of twenty-one or thereabouts. Thirlewalle testified that his father, when he died, was "of the age of $\frac{xx}{vij}$ and v," and that it had been "forty and iiij years" since his death; from his testimony we also learn that his father had been armed during sixty-nine years and that he was probably present at the battle of Falkirk in 1298. If these figures be accepted as accurate, the deponent's father must have been seven score and five years old and have died about 1342. There are reasons for doubting the accuracy of the record at this point,[1] but it is practically certain that the elder Thirlewalle attained a very advanced age and was perhaps a centenarian—his son stated him to have been at the time of his death the oldest esquire in the North.

It is evident from his deposition that the deponent had seen much active service in the wars of the period, and since he distinguishes between his direct assertions and what "he had heard," it may be assumed that he himself was in the army before Paris in 1360, at Balynghamhill and Caux in the autumn of 1369 under the duke of Lancaster, and connected with the expedition into Scotland under the king in person, in August, 1385.[2]

There is, of course, no direct proof that the "Thuireval" of Deschamps' ballade refers to the Thirlewalle who testified in the Scrope and Grosvenor controversy; the probabilities, however, favor such an identification, and it may therefore be worth our while to collect what information we can regarding John Thirlewalle. As the deponent testified that he was from the North he must have been connected in some way with the family of Thirlewalles that were for generations seated at Thirlewall castle in the county of Northumberland.[3] The account becomes at times a bit

[1] Besides the inherent improbability that he was 145 years old, it should be noted that if this age be accepted as accurate, then the son was born when the father was about 135 years of age, and the father was over one hundred at the battle of Falkirk, and not armed until late in life. The terms in which the age and other figures are given offer an easy opportunity for making mistakes, and the error was probably made by the scribe who took down the deposition rather than by the deponent. I am reminded of this point by Professor Kittredge, to whom I also owe thanks for many other corrections and suggestions.

[2] For an account of these expeditions see Mackinnon, *History of Edward the Third*, London, 1900.

[3] Professor Kittredge has called my attention to the account of the Thirlwalls contained in Hodgson's *History of Northumberland*, Pt. II, Vol. III (1840): Thirlwall township and manor, p. 143; Thirlwall pedigree, pp. 144–46; Thirlwall castle, pp. 147, 148.

confusing owing to the fact that there were three John Thirlwalls —John Thirlwall, Senior, who was the father of John Thirlwall, Junior, who was in turn the father of another John Thirlwall. It will perhaps conduce to clearness if the names are taken up in the order just given.

In October, 1365, as John de Thirlwall, Senior, and then in the King's service, he had letters of protection for himself, men, and servants in Greenhowe and Rileygh, in Lidale (*Rot. Scot*,, I, 896). In 1369 we find him styled lord of the castle and manor of Thirlwall (*Evid.* 8);[1] and in the same year he was in a commission on border matters for the West Marches with his neighbor Thomas de Blenkensop, the bishop of Carlisle, and others (*Rot. Scot.*, I, 935). In 1377, he was a witness to the Swinburne entail of lands on his son [grand-son] John; and, in 1379, on a commission on matters respecting the Middle Marches (III, ii, 34; *Rot. Scot.*, II, 20).[2]

In 1369 John Thirlwall, Junior, constituted Philip Thirlwall his special attorney to give livery in his name to John Thirlwall, Senior, lord of the castle and manor of Thirlwall.[3] In that same year Thomas de Penreth granted lands in the forest of Inglewood in Northumberland to John Thirlwall and Christiana his wife (Cristina in record).[4] On February 18, 1379, John de Thirlwall "the younger" of Cumberland, with seven others, was appointed "to array and equip with arms all the men in that county capable of defending it, so as to resist hostile invasion and the destruction of the English tongue."[5] Among his associates was John Derwentwater before whom the John Thirlewalle of the Scrope and Grosvenor trial testified. On May 13 (3 Ric. II), John de Thirlewall, Junior, with four others, was commissioned to arrest all who export skins and wool felts from England into

[1] Hodgson, p. 147; Landsd. MS., 1448, fol. 55.

[2] Hodgson, p. 145.

[3] Hodgson, pp. 145, 147.

[4] Nicolas is wrong in ascribing to him the reference in *Rot. Scot.*, 39 Edw. III., m. 4; this record refers to John Thirwall, Senior (see above). *Rot. Scot.*, I, 896; *Rot. Orig.*, II, 296; Nicolas, *Scrope and Grosvenor Controversy*, II, 425-26. See also pp. 427-33, where Nicolas has given a sketch of Clifford which may be compared with the fuller account compiled by Professor Kittredge. Richard de Thirlwall, king's yeoman, received a grant referring to the forest of Inglewood, dated at Stirling, June 13, 1337 (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 11 Edw. III, Pt. III, m. 30, 1334-38. p. 460), which he later resigned (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 14 Edw. III, Pt. I, m. 20, 1338-40, p. 453).

[5] *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 2 Ric. II, Pt. II, m. 31 d., 1377-81, p. 359.

Scotland.[1] The connection of John Thirlwall, Junior, with the King's expedition into Scotland is shown by an order, dated July 28, 1385, detailing him and five others to guard the town and castle of Carlisle with ninety men-at-arms and a hundred archers in the absence of John de Nevil, keeper of the town and castle, "whom the King has ordered to accompany him in his present expedition of war against Scotland."[2] During this war (December 11, 1386) John Thirlewall the younger was granted remission for life of 24*s*. 6*d*. of the yearly rent of 64*s*. 6*d*. at which he held, by grant of Edward III to him and to Christiana his wife, sixty-four and one-half acres in the royal waste of Inglewood.[3] John de Thirlewall the younger was twice appointed (February 20, May 20, 1386) controller of certain repairs to the fortifications of the castle of Carlisle.[4]

John de Thirlwall, Senior, was a son-in-law of Sir William Swinburne, and in 1377 certain estates of the Swinburnes were entailed upon his grandson John de Thirlwall on the condition of his bearing the name and arms of William de Swinburne.[5] The phrase used in the document is "Johannis filio Johannis de Thirlwall junioris;" among the witnesses, as has been already noted, was "Johanne Thirlewall seniore."

There are in the records of the time other notices referring to John Thirlewall without mention of "Junior" or "Senior." Someone of that name represented the county of Cumberland in the Parliament that met at Westminster in October, 1386,[6] and John Thelwall was sheriff of Cumberland county on November 20, 1386.[7] The form Thelewele appears occasionally as a variant for Thirlewalle,[8] and it may therefore be that we have a reference to Thirlewalle's death in the mention on July 1, 1394, of Richard Wynwyk, "executor of the will of John de Thelewall."[9] The arms of

[1] Hodgson, p. 145; *Rot. Scot.*, 3 Ric. II, m. 3, II, p. 22.

[2] *Cal. Pat Rolls*, 9 Ric. II, Pt. I, m. 39, 1385–89, p. 10.

[3] *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 9 Ric. II, Pt. I, m. 5, 1385–89, p. 71.

[4] *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 9 Ric. II, Pt. II, mm. 21, 31, 385–89, pp. 112, 129,

[5] Hodgson, Pt. III, Vol. II, p. 34 (1828); Pt. II, Vol. III, p. 145 (1840).

[6] *Rot. Claus.*, 10 Ric. II, m. 16 d.

[7] *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 10 Ric. II, Pt. I, m. 13, 1385–89, p. 238.

[8] *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, Ric. II, 1377–81, General Index under "Thelwall."

[9] *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 18 Ric. II, Pt. II, m. 34, 1391–96, p. 540. The date would accord well with the age given by the deponent in 1386.

Thirlewalle were, Sable, a chevron argent between three boars' heads couped Or.[1]

Although the identification is by no means certain, it is not improbable that the John Thirlwall referred to in these last records is in some cases, if not in all, John Thirlwall, Junior. It would also seem probable that the John Thirlewalle of the Scrope and Grosvenor controversy was John Thirlwall, Junior, were it not for one point. The deponent testified in 1386 that it had been "forty and iiij years" since his father's death, whereas, as we have seen, the father of John Thirlwall, Junior, was living in 1377. Hodgson regards this evidence as conclusive, but I am inclined to think that the question is still at least doubtful. In the first place, it will be noted that the deponent does not definitely state that his father died in 1342, but says that it has been forty and four years since the death of his father. We have already seen that there must have been a scribal error in this testimony, because the deponent at the same time stated that his father was 145 years old. I think that it is not unlikely that the mistake extends to the "forty and four" as well as to the "seven score and five"—perhaps the first phrase should have been merely "four."

Furthermore, unless the error is regarded as affecting the statements of the deponent as to the death as well as the age of his father, his statements will be inconsistent. He himself was born in 1331–32; his father, though not 145 years old, must still have been an extremely old man, since the deponent specifically stated that his father had borne arms sixty-nine years and was at the time of his death the oldest esquire in the North. If, now, 1342 be regarded as the correct date of his father's death, then the deponent must have been born within ten years of that event—that is to say, probably after the father was over eighty years of age, certainly after he had reached the age of seventy. If the statement that his father had borne arms sixty-nine years be correct, the father must have been at least seventy years old, and probably older, at the birth of his son. Minor points that also make for the identification are the fact that the deponent's father was an esquire, as was also the father of John Thirlwall, Junior,

[1] Vincent's "Northumberland" in the College of Arms.

and the fact that all the probabilities favor such a view; the details given in the deposition fit John Thirlwall, Junior, and there is no other John Thirlwall known to whom they could be ascribed.

But whether this identification be correct or not, we have at least ascertained that the hitherto unidentified "Thuireval" of Deschamps' ballade was almost certainly an English knight named Thirlwall.

ALFRED ALLAN KERN

MILLSAPS COLLEGE
Jackson, Miss.

EICHENDORFF AND THE VOLKSLIED

Critics of Eichendorff generally assume the existence of a more or less intimate relation between his lyric and the Volkslied. But the manner and extent of this popular influence in his choice of themes, in his views of life and nature, and in his diction and versification, has never been definitely determined.[1]

Eichendorff's connection with the general movement of the Romantic School in favor of popular poetry was, at the beginning of his poetic career, a close one. He attended the University of Heidelberg in the year 1807–8, at a time when this movement had reached there its climax in the appearance of *Des Knaben Wunderhorn* (1806–8) and of Görres' *Volksbücher* (1807). His relation to Görres was one of respectful intimacy and he attended his lectures and assisted him in the preparation of the supplement to the *Volksbücher*, published in the *Heidelberger Jahrbücher*, 1808.[2] Eichendorff did not, however, collect folksongs for *Des Knaben Wunderhorn* as Höber, for example, would have us believe.[3] It is even possible, if not probable, in the light of recent investigation, that he never came in contact in Heidelberg with the publishers of the *Wunderhorn* and that it was not until the winter and spring of 1809–10, in Berlin, that Eichendorff formed a close friendship with the two.[4] However, Eichendorff could not have left Heidelberg without having shared in a large measure the prevailing interest in German folk-poetry. The *Wunderhorn* was easily accessible, he was associated with Görres, had as his most intimate friend Count Loeben, who showed a warm interest in all kinds of popular poetry, and he read *Die Zeitung für Einsiedler*, which was first published in the spring of 1808 and which contained contributions in the popular manner from Uhland and Kerner, and essays on folk-poetry by others.

[1] An investigation of this subject is to appear in my dissertation soon to be published.

[2] Wilhelm Kosch, *Briefe und Dichtungen aus dem Nachlass des Freiherrn Joseph von Eichendorff*, Köln, 1906.

[3] *Eichendorffs Jugenddichtungen*, Berlin, 1894, p. 21.

[4] Cf. Pissin, *Otto Heinrich, Graf von Loeben*, Berlin, 1905, pp. 135 ff.; but see also Kosch, "Zur Geschichte der Heidelberger Romantick," *Euphorion*, Vol. XIV (1907), p. 310.

The interest in the Volkslied which Eichendorff had thus gained at Heidelberg came to expression soon after his return to his home in Silesia where he began a collection of German and Polish popular tales, for which his knowledge of the Polish language peculiarly fitted him.[1] This work was unfortunately cut short in 1810 by his removal to Vienna, and was never published. It is not unlikely that the material which he had thus brought together would, if accessible, aid us materially in determining his relation to popular poetry.

Eichendorff's early contact with the Volkslied is further shown by his own productions. From the beginning of his poetic career until its close, we notice two prominent influences at work in his lyric, the romantic and the popular. The poems written during 1808, which practically mark the beginning of his literary activity, were produced almost wholly under the influence of the Romantic School and particularly under the influence of Novalis, Tieck, and Loeben.[2] But we notice also in this early period a new force at work in Eichendorff's lyric, slight but unmistakable, which in most respects directly counteracts the first. In the group of 70 poems which Pissin lists under the year 1808 not more than half a dozen show clearly Volkslied influence.[3] But the themes of these are almost wholly free from the romantic haze which pervades the others. Vague, allusive expressions after the manner of Tieck and his followers, like "Wunderfernen," "dunkle Zaubergänge," "goldne Träume," "süsschauernd," "seltsam lockend," have given way here to a vocabulary representing simpler and more definite ideas in imitation of the Volkslied. Beginning with the year 1809 the Volkslied exerts a prominent influence upon the lyric of Eichendorff, and it is an interesting fact that during the next five years he gives us nearly all the songs that have become most popular.[4]

[1] Goedeke, *Grundriss*, zweite Aufl., Vol. VIII, p. 179.

[2] Note, e. g., the sonnets to Loeben in Joseph und Wilhelm von Eichendorffs *Jugendgedichte*, hrsg. von R. Pissin, Berlin (no date), pp. 3 ff.; further, his poetic effusions to the Virgin, *ibid.*, pp. 9 ff.; also "Die Zauberin im Walde," *ibid.*, p. 40.

[3] E. g., "Erwartung," *ibid.*, p. 25, "Abendständchen," p. 26, and "Trost," p. 55.

[4] Under the year 1809 may be cited "Herbstliedchen," *Jugendgedichte*, p. 56, "Die Kleine," p. 57, "Jäger u. Jägerin," p. 58, "Studentenfahrt," p. 60, "Die Stille," p. 61, "Mein Schatz, das ist ein kluges Kind," p. 65, songs which have every characteristic of the Volkslied.

Heine has often been compared with Eichendorff, and it is not to be denied that there exist many points of similarity between them. But in their relation to the Volkslied there is also an important difference. While Heine, in his best poetic period, represented by the "Lyrisches Intermezzo" and the "Heimkehr," presents one style, a resultant, so to speak, of two forces, the romantic and the popular, from which we find little variance, in Eichendorff the same two influences run parallel. In other words, Eichendorff presents two styles which often unite but which not infrequently appear definite and distinct. In the one he continues in a modified degree the romantic tendencies so prominent in his early period. In many poems representing this style the influence of the Volkslied, while evident, is but slight. In illustration of this we quote the first stanza of "Nachtzauber" (1853):[1]

Hörst du nicht die Quellen gehen
Zwischen Stein und Blumen weit
Nach den stillen Waldesseen,
Wo die Marmorbilder stehen
In der schönen Einsamkeit?
Von den Bergen sacht hernieder,
Weckend die uralten Lieder,
Steigt die wunderbare Nacht,
Und die Gründe glänzen wieder,
Wie du's oft im Traum gedacht.[1]

On the other hand Eichendorff has a large list of poems which lack almost entirely the characteristics of those cited; their style is that of the Volkslied. Contrast, for example, the stanza quoted above with the following from "Studentenfahrt" (1809).[3]

Der Frühling ist der Freudensaal,
Viel tausend Vöglein spielen auf,
Da schallt's im Wald bergab, bergauf:
Grüss dich, mein Schatz, viel tausendmal!

[1] *Gedichte* (Dietze), p. 215.

[2] See further, in *Jugendgedichte:* "Nachtfeier" (1810), p. 74, "Mittagsruh" (1811), p. 99, "Zeichen" (1812), p. 107, "Die wunderliche Prinzessin" (1812), p. 120, *Gedichte:* the large number of sonnets, also "Die Lerche" (1818), p. 179, "Der Abend" (1826), p. 38, "Morgenständchen" (1833), p. 184, "Lockung" (1834), p. 91, "Der Weckruf" (1834), p. 269, "Todeslust" (1840), p. 287, "In der Nacht, 2" (composed 1849), p. 263. Date of poems cited from *Jugendgedichte* is year of composition; the date of those cited from *Gedichte* is year of publication, since their date of composition is, in most cases, uncertain.

[3] *Jugendgedichte*, p. 66.

Querüber über's Wasser glatt
Lass werben deine Aeugelein,
Und der dir wohlgefallen hat,
Der soll dein lieber Buhle sein.[1]

The natural inference from this is that the popular manner remained with Eichendorff a conscious thing. But we need not conclude from this that his popular songs are therefore something stilted and artificial. He shows from the very beginning a penetration into the mode of thought and speech of the folk such as we do not find for example in the early popular productions of Heine and Wilhelm Müller. While these[2] acquired the art of composition in the popular style by laboriously copying both the themes and the diction of the Volkslied, Eichendorff shows much more independence, particularly in his choice of themes. Many of his songs give the same general impression as does the Volkslied. They have the same simple theme, they are similar in vocabulary, turn of phrase and stanzaic structure. But when we attempt to trace the direct sources of these we do so with little success.

The probable sources of two of Eichendorff's songs, "Das zerbrochene Ringlein"[3] and "Lied mit Thränen"[4] have long been known. A more direct borrowing, however, than either of these, which seems thus far to have escaped notice, is his "Verschwiegene Liebe," a poem of two stanzas, the first of which particularly concerns us and reads:

Ueber Wipfel und Saaten
In den Glanz hinein—
Wer mag sie erraten,
Wer holte sie ein?
Gedanken sich wiegen,
Die Nacht ist verschwiegen,
Gedanken sind frei.[5]

[1] For further illustrations see poems cited above (p. 512, n. 4). Also *Jugendgedichte:* "Der Jäger Abschied" (1810), p. 83, "Der Sänger" (1811), p. 90, "Das zerbrochene Ringlein" (1812), p. 111, "Der verirrte Jäger" (1812), p. 117; *Gedichte:* "Die ernsthafte Fastnacht" (composed 1814), p. 135, "Der Musikant" (1826), p. 14, "Der Soldat" (1826), p. 20, "Wanderlied der Prager Studenten" (1826) p. 50, "Wanderschaft" (1833), p. 12, "Die Zigeunerin" (1834) p. 19, "Uebermut" (1837), p. 192, "Der Bote" (1837), p. 193, "Kehraus" (1838), p. 346, "Die Saale" (1841), p. 313.

[2] Allen, *Wilhelm Müller and the German Volkslied*, Chicago (Diss.), 1901, p. 82. Goetze, *H. Heines Buch der Lieder u. sein Verhältnis zum deutschen Volkslied*, Halle (Diss.), 1895, p. 10.

[3] Vilmar, *Handbüchlein für Freunde des deutschen Volksliedes*, Marburg, 1867, p. 194.

[4] Höber, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

[5] *Gedichte*, p. 214.

The poem was no doubt written in the poet's later years, since it was first published in *Robert und Guiscard* (1855) and did not appear in the collected poems until the second edition, Leipzig, 1864. Eichendorff had here in mind the well-known Volkslied "Gedanken sind frei," the first stanza of which is especially in point:

Die Gedanken sind frey,
Wer kann sie errathen;
Sie rauschen vorbei
Wie nächtliche Schatten.
Kein Mensch kann sie wissen,
Kein Jäger sie schiessen;
Es bleibet dabey,
Die Gedanken sind frey.

We have in these two stanzas not only an exact correspondence in theme, but the stanzas are almost identical in structure, and lines three and seven of Eichendorff's poem correspond with lines two and eight of the Volkslied. The Volkslied appears in *Des Knaben Wunderhorn* (1808), Vol. III, p. 38, under the title "Lied des Verfolgten im Thurm" (Nach Schweizerliedern), a version almost twice the length of the original Volkslied, showing clearly the hand of the editors. The Volkslied stanza above quoted appears, however, without change at the beginning of the song in the *Wunderhorn*.

It is probable that Eichendorff first became acquainted with the folksong in this form, but he no doubt also knew the original, since the song was common in Silesia and had found its way into Hoffmann and Richter's *Schlesische Volkslieder* (Leipzig, 1842), thirteen years before Eichendorff's poem was printed.[1]

But with the exception of "Das zerbrochene Ringlein" it is not in his direct copyings of the Volkslied that he has most successfully reproduced its spirit. It is rather in poems like "Studentenfahrt," "Der Glücksritter," and "Der Soldat," songs for which no direct sources have thus far been found in the Volkslied, that he identifies himself most happily with the thoughts, feelings, and manner of speech of the common people.

J. H. HEINZELMAN
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[1] Cf. also Tobler, *Schweizerische Volkslieder*, Frauenfeld, 1882, p. cxxix.

ALTERNATION IN THE STAGING OF SHAKESPEARE'S PLAYS

In his careful discussion of "Some Principles of Elizabethan Staging,"[1] Dr. George F. Reynolds states thus the view of Kilian, Genée, Brandl, and Brodmeier[2] concerning the nature of the Elizabethan stage:

> These writers assume the triple stage [made up of front stage, rear stage, and balcony]; suppose most, if not all, of the properties to have been placed on the rear stage; and by the use of a few of Shakespeare's plays, Brodmeier alone taking account of all, attempt to establish what one may call an alternation staging; that is, that the plays were so constructed that no two differently set scenes on the rear stage ever came directly in succession, but that front and rear stage were used alternately, the rear stage being arranged while the front stage was in use.[3]
>
> Most alternationists . . . . tend to put almost any located scene on the rear stage. But since a clash—that is, the occurrence of two *in* scenes in direct succession—is fatal to the theory, its whole purpose being to avoid breaks and pauses in the action, scenes before and after these *in* scenes must be *out* scenes. Most scenes in some way or other, however, are located, and a large number use doors or balconies or properties [thus showing that they are played on the rear stage, according to Brodmeier], so that usually only short, relatively unimportant scenes remain to be classed as *out*. This, in turn, leads to a greater emphasis than ever on the rear stage, and to classifying as *out* any short scenes of which the purpose is obscure. At once a purpose easily suggests itself for such scenes—they fill the time while the rear stage is being prepared. This is the final result of the theory: authors, in order to secure this alternation, had so to construct their plays that no two *in* scenes should occur together, and actually composed short "carpenter" scenes for this purpose. Alternation becomes therefore a factor in play-construction—it sums up the influence upon the playwright of his theatrical environment.[4]

The present writer has, on a previous occasion, stated this theory of alternation staging in the following manner:

[1] *Modern Philology*, II, 581–614, and III, 69–97.

[2] Genée, *Jahrbuch*, Vol. XXVI; Kilian, *ibid.*, Vols. XXVIII, XXXVI. Full references in Reynolds, II, 582. The references to Brandl and Brodmeier are given later.

[3] II, 582.

[4] II, 586.

Professor Alois Brandl believes that, inasmuch as the back stage was furnished and arranged to represent in a rough way each specific indoor scene, two back scenes representing decidedly different interiors could not come in succession, since this would give no opportunity to change the furnishings, and the Elizabethan audiences had not learned to wait. In *Antony and Cleopatra* a scene in a room of one palace is free to follow or precede another palace scene, whether in Rome or Alexandria. But Brandl thinks that Shakespeare was compelled to insert at least one front scene whenever two back scenes with different settings would otherwise come together.[1]

One method of dramatic presentation employed by the Elizabethans which seems strange to us, was clearly elucidated by Dr. Reynolds for the first time. It is the use of what he calls the symbolic, incongruous stage.

This convention allowed the presence upon the stage of a property or furnishing which was incongruous to the scene in progress, and which, during that scene, was thought of as absent, though standing in plain sight. This incongruity took two forms: either the close juxtaposition upon the stage of two properties which in reality should have been a much greater distance apart, or the presence of a property in a scene where it could never naturally have been; as a tree, for example, in the midst of a room scene. It is directly in contradiction to our modern ideal of securing complete illusion and a perfectly harmonious stage picture.[2]

The following passages from the conclusion of Dr. Reynolds' dissertation complete the citations which concern us at present:

Which of the four forms of staging—the simple method of the early days, the classical method of *Jocasta*, the alternation staging, or the incongruous—was most prevalent, is a question which must, in the very nature of things, remain open. The classical form could not have been very common, for the plays in their frequent changes of scene would not allow it. The others seem rather to have been used together than in any separate and carefully distinguished way. . . . . Absolute tests for both alternation and incongruity are lacking; it is therefore impossible to give any definite answer to the question opening the paragraph. . . . . The theory [of alternation] has been supposed to apply where it certainly does not, and its importance overemphasized.[3]

[1] From "Shakespeare's Stage and Modern Adaptations," *The Views about Hamlet and Other Essays*, Boston, 1904, p. 128. Brandl's view is found in his Introduction to a new edition of the Schlegel-Tieck translation of Shakespeare, Leipzig, 1897.

[2] III, 69.

[3] III, 94, 97.

Without questioning the carefully drawn conclusions of Dr. Reynolds, it is well to ask: Are there any cases in Shakespeare where we can establish a strong probability that some definite group of scenes in a play was presented in accordance with the method of alternate staging? I shall advance the opinion that certain specified scenes in Shakespeare are of such a nature and have such a dramatic context that two things concerning them are highly probable: first, that each of these scenes was played on the front, uncovered portion of the Elizabethan stage as an outdoor scene; second, that, while the scene was being played on the front stage, the back stage, concealed by drawn curtains, was either being cleared away, or was being set for the coming scene, or was being both cleared and set.

If there is any truth whatever in the theory of alternation staging, there would be an especial occasion and reason for it in connection with an indoor scene which called for an unusually elaborate setting of the back stage. Some of these scenes, such as an elaborate judicial proceeding, a coronation, or some other state function, might well require the use of the entire stage; but even though the players overflowed upon the front stage, the properties which especially indicated the indoor nature of the scene would presumably be massed upon the rear stage, which resembled a room in being under cover. Such a scene may be termed a full scene, in distinction from one which is supposed to be confined to either the front or the rear stage. It is well, however, to remember that, when the balcony was employed to represent the summit of the wall of a castle or city, then the rear stage, representing the space immediately before this wall, was conceived as being in the open air.

I desire to show that each of the following five scenes probably owes either its existence or at least the form which it takes to the fact that the method of alternation staging was made use of in that part of the play which is concerned: *Richard II*, III, iv; *The Merchant of Venice*, III, v; *Antony and Cleopatra*, III, i; *Cymbeline*, II, i; *The Winter's Tale*, V, ii.

The scenes will be discussed in this order, which is approximately that in which they were written. There may be other

scenes in Shakespeare which would be equally in point, but I prefer to discuss only these. I am seeking merely to establish the probability of alternation staging in a few selected cases.[1]

Richard II, III, iv

In scene iii of Act III, Bolingbroke, York, and others appear before Flint Castle in Wales. Percy enters and informs them that King Richard is within the castle. Bolingbroke tells the lords with him to announce the terms on which he will submit to his sovereign. There is a "*Parle without, and answer within: then a flourish. Enter on the walls*, KING RICHARD, the BISHOP OF CARLISLE," and others. Later, after a long colloquy, Northumberland calls the King down into "the base court" to speak with Bolingbroke; Richard and his attendants come down from above and enter below (ll. 177, 183, 186). There are no directions at these places in the Folio, but these statements are made entirely certain by the context. The scene soon closes with King Richard's acceptance of Bolingbroke's demand that the banishment of the latter be repealed and his inheritance restored to him.

In this scene the balcony represents the battlements of Flint Castle. Since one of the doors of the rear stage comes into the action, they are both undoubtedly visible all the time, and we are dealing with a rear scene, or better, a full scene. This would be equally true whether the rear stage be of the type seen in the De Witt picture of the Swan Theatre, or be what Dr. Reynolds calls a "corridor stage."[2] What has been said would not apply to the "alcove" rear stage.[2] Dr. Reynolds would "admit the alcove stage as one of the possible forms, if not as the most general form of stage construction"; but says concerning the testimony of the four early pictures:

> The Swan [Theatre] could not have had an alcove stage; the Red Bull picture shows no alcove stage; the Roxana and Messalina pictures, though they might be construed to do so, perhaps do not.[3]

[1] The first four of these scenes were stated to be of this kind in the present writer's paper upon "Shakespeare's Stage and Modern Adaptations," *The Views about Hamlet*, etc., Boston, 1904, p. 128. The scene from *The Winter's Tale* was not mentioned. Two scenes there named, *Richard III*, III, vi, and *Julius Caesar*, III, iii, are less clear, and will not be touched upon. So far as the present writer knows, he is the first to suggest that the scenes from *Richard II*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, and *The Winter's Tale* are of this kind.

[2] II, 589. [3] II, 604, 603.

Elsewhere he says:

> The Messalina and Roxana stages, though they allow the supposition that other doors, not shown in the picture, existed at either side of the stage, hardly suggest any such theory.[1]

I will assume it as probable, therefore, that the present play was not intended for a rear stage of the alcove type.

Act IV of this play consists of the long, spectacular scene in Westminster Hall in which King Richard is deposed. The stage-direction in the Folio is: *Enter as to the Parliament, Bullingbrooke, Aumerle, Northumberland, Percie, Fitz-Water, Surrey, Carlile, Abbot of Westminster.* [An unnamed Lord, who speaks ll. 52–56, is omitted.] *Herauld, Officers, and Bagot.* Later York, King Richard, and various attendants join the company already on the stage. If any attempt at realism were made, and the Folio direction suggests such an attempt, this scene would be somewhat elaborately set. The seating of "the Parliament" would be made as impressive as possible. The bringing on and arranging of the seats would require some time, and there may well have been other features of the setting designed to give realistic quality or impressiveness to the scene. How was this time obtained?

Between the two scenes which have just been discussed comes the remarkable pathos scene of the Queen and the Gardener (III, iv). Since this scene closes the act, we naturally think of the act-interval as perhaps occupying some time; but I shall reserve the question of the act-interval for a few remarks near the close of the paper.

In scene iv of Act III, the Queen and her two ladies are walking in the garden of the Duke of York. When the Gardener and his two servants come in to their labors, the ladies step aside in order to overhear what they will say, the Queen feeling sure that they "will talk of state." In dignified blank verse the Gardener and his men interpret their garden as an allegory of a rightly ordered kingdom. When at last the Gardener declares that King Richard is to be deposed, the Queen comes forward and utters passionate lamentations.

[1] II, 592, 593.

Professor Herford well says that the Queen "has no other *raison d'être* in the drama than at intervals to reinforce our difficult and precarious pity for the king."[1] But her forebodings of evil in II, ii, followed by her grief at the evil news that Bolingbroke has landed, are an entirely natural and organic part of the play; so are the farewells of herself and Richard in V, i. The scene now before us, however, with its gardener and servants discoursing on state-craft in formal blank-verse, and almost binding up "dangling apricocks" to slow music, seems forced and artificial for Shakespeare at this stage of his development. I offer the suggestion that this artificial outdoor scene owes its existence, in part at least, to the dramatist's desire to present something upon the front stage while the rear stage, shut off by curtains, was being prepared for the spectacular deposition scene.

Scene i of Act V, which immediately follows the deposing of King Richard, takes place upon a street leading to the Tower. It is the farewell of King and Queen already alluded to. As an outdoor scene it would naturally be played on the front stage. During its progress the rear stage could easily be cleared.

The Merchant of Venice, III, v

Scene iv of Act III takes place in a room in Portia's house in Belmont, and presumably was played upon the rear stage. The great trial scene before the Duke, Act IV, scene i, while primarily an indoor scene and belonging especially to the rear stage, undoubtedly overflowed upon the front stage, and was a full scene. The opening direction in the Folio is: *Enter the Duke, the Magnificoes, Anthonio, Bassanio, and Gratiano.* Soon Shylock enters, later the disguised Portia and Nerissa. This scene was probably presented with all the pomp and display then attainable; this would concern especially the costumes worn, but some care would naturally be expended in preparing the rear stage.

The scene that comes between these two that have just been described may well be in the main a stop-gap, planned to interest the audience while the rear stage is being made ready for the trial scene. The act-divisions of *The Merchant of Venice* are given in

[1] *The Eversley Shakespeare*, VI, 130.

the First Folio; the scene-divisions are not indicated, but seem to be clear. The scene in question appears to be laid in Portia's garden. Launcelot begins by insisting to Jessica that her father's sins will be laid upon her; "therefore be of good cheer, for truly I think you are damned." Jessica pleads that her husband has made her a Christian; but Launcelot blames him for this very thing. "This making of Christians will raise the price of hogs: if we grow all to be pork-eaters, we shall not shortly have a rasher on the coals for money." Lorenzo entering, Jessica reports to him their conversation. Lorenzo answers with a charge against the jesting servant: "the Moor is with child by you, Launcelot." This turn is most uncalled for, a gratuitous blot upon our happy Launcelot and upon a charming play. Lorenzo next commands Launcelot, "Go in, sirrah; bid them prepare for dinner." Launcelot quibbles over the meaning of Lorenzo's words. At last the latter insists that the servant shall "understand a plain man in his plain meaning," and the servant goes into the house. Jessica then utters a panegyric upon Portia, declaring enthusiastically that "the poor rude world hath not her fellow." With some charming banter between the young bride and groom the scene closes.

Now what is this scene for? It does furnish relief before the intense trial scene, and to some this will seem a sufficient reason for its existence. The feature in it that bears most directly upon the play is Jessica's tribute to Portia; but a few added lines in the moonlight scene would have served just as well. All the rest of the scene is superfluous, and one feature, as has been noted, is also offensive. Although the scene gives some charming humorous relief, I suggest, on the whole, that Shakespeare, having nothing to do while the rear stage is being prepared, is here doing nothing in an interesting way.

The two scenes which follow the trial before the Duke are played out of doors, one on a street of Venice, the other, the moonlight scene in Portia's garden at Belmont. These are presumably played on the front stage, and the rear stage is not again needed.

Antony and Cleopatra, III, i

On one occasion, while reading scene i of Act III of *Antony and Cleopatra*, the thought suddenly flashed upon me that the scene is decidedly superfluous, not a necessary part of the play. The idea came quite independently of any theory about the Elizabethan stage. And is there any weighty reason why we should follow thus carefully the campaign of Ventidius against the Parthians? What are the Parthians to us? To be sure, the scene is prepared for in II, iv, where Antony dispatched Ventidius to Parthia. The practical wisdom of Ventidius in III, i, his shrewd philosophy of life, is so excellent in itself that it blinds us to the superfluousness of the scene. He has just routed the Parthians. Silius urges him to complete the victory. Ventidius replies:

> O Silius, Silius,
> I have done enough; a lower place, note well,
> May make too great an act: for learn this, Silius;
> Better to leave undone, than by our deed
> Acquire too high a fame when him we serve's away.
> Caesar and Antony have ever won
> More in their officer than person: Sossius,
> One of my place in Syria, his lieutenant,
> For quick accumulation of renown,
> Which he achieved by the minute, lost his favour.
> Who does i' the wars more than his captain can
> Becomes his captain's captain: and ambition,
> The soldier's virtue, rather makes choice of loss,
> Than gain which darkens him.
> I could do more to do Antonius good,
> But 'twould offend him; and in his offence
> Should my performance perish.
> *Silius.* Thou hast, Ventidius, that
> Without the which a soldier, and his sword,
> Grants scarce distinction. Thou wilt write to Antony?
> *Ventidius.* I'll humbly signify what in his name,
> That magical word of war, we have effected.[1]

It is noticeable that this scene comes just after the remarkable banquet and revel upon Pompey's galley, II, vii, and just before a scene in Caesar's house at Rome, III, ii, though act and scene divisions are not marked in the Folio. How much of an attempt

[1] III, i, 11-31.

was made to indicate the interior of a galley, is a question. By 1607 or 1608 the management of the Globe Theatre would probably attempt some verisimilitude in such a matter.

Brodmeier supposes that the entire preparation of the rear stage to represent the interior of Pompey's galley in II, vii, takes place while the servants who bring on the banquet are speaking the first nineteen lines.[1] Although the preceding scene has been played in the open air upon the front stage, Pompey and his force have entered "*at one doore*" and the triumvirs and their soldiers "*at another*"; and the doors seem not to have been covered during the entire scene.

The direction of the Folio at the beginning of II, vii, reads in full:

Musicke playes.
Enter two or three Servants with a Banket.

The purpose of the music seems to be to occupy the time while the rear stage is being set, presumably behind drawn curtains. When all other preparations are completed, including the bringing on of a table and seats for about a dozen persons, then apparently the music ceases, the curtains open, and the banquet is brought on by those who are to serve it. While doing this the servants talk most incisively about the drunkenness and weakness of Lepidus.

The scene between Ventidius and Silius that has already been discussed, III, i, would give an opportunity for clearing away this banquet, after the close of II, vii, and for transforming the rear stage from the cabin of Pompey's galley to a room in Caesar's house. I suggest that the scene was inserted primarily for this purpose.

Cymbeline, II, i

We can be sure that several bulky properties were employed in presenting scene ii of Act II of *Cymbeline*. The opening direction in the Cambridge Shakespeare reads: "*Imogen's bedchamber in Cymbeline's palace: a trunk in one corner of it.* IMOGEN *in bed, reading;* a Lady *attending.*" This is an interpretation and expansion of the naïve Folio direction, *Enter Imogen, in her*

[1] *Die Shakespeare-Bühne nach den alten Bühnenanweisungen*, Weimar, 1904, p. 89.

Bed, and a Lady. After l. 10 the usual editions add only one word to the direction of the Folio, *Sleepes. Iachimo* [*comes*] *from the Trunke.* At l. 50 the *Clocke strikes.* The *Exit* of the Folio which closes the scene, the Cambridge edition expands into *Goes into the trunk. The scene closes.*

Imogen has been reading three hours when the scene opens. She says to the lady in waiting,

> Take not away the taper, leave it burning.

As Iachimo bends over the sleeping Imogen, he says:

> the flame o' the taper
> Bows toward her, and would under-peep her lids.

So far the scene requires the following properties, not including Imogen's book and bracelet: a bed with the proper covering, the trunk containing Iachimo, a lighted taper and a stand, and a clock, though this was undoubtedly manipulated behind the stage. The following words of Iachimo demand some further properties, though we do not know how realistically the stage was set:

> But my design,
> To note the chamber: I will write all down:
> Such and such pictures; there the window; such
> The adornment of her bed; the arras; figures,
> Why, such and such; and the contents o' the story.

In II, iv, when Iachimo convinces Posthumus that Imogen has sinned, this chamber is very elaborately described.

> It was hang'd
> With tapestry of silk and silver; the story
> Proud Cleopatra, when she met her Roman,
> And Cydnus swell'd above the banks, or for
> The press of boats or pride: a piece of work
> So bravely done, so rich, that it did strive
> In workmanship and value . . . . .
> . . . . . The chimney
> Is south the chamber, and the chimney-piece
> Chaste Dian bathing: never saw I figures
> So likely to report themselves: the cutter
> Was as another nature, dumb; outwent her,
> Motion and breath left out . . . . .
> . . . . . The roof o' the chamber

With golden cherubins is fretted: her andirons—
I had forgot them—were two winking Cupids
Of silver, each on one foot standing, nicely
Depending on their brands.[1]

According to the First Folio only one scene has intervened since the audience beheld this very room. Undoubtedly the chamber as seen did not wholly justify this glowing description; but was it not made to conform to it in a general way?

There is good reason for believing that the setting of the stage received greatly increased attention during the closing years of Shakespeare's career. Beginning about 1608, the masque came to its full development and to exceptional popularity under the leadership of Ben Jonson. Not only should we expect the remarkable scenic effects produced in the masques to exert an influence upon the public stage, but it is a simple matter of fact that Shakespeare's last plays, *Cymbeline*, *The Winter's Tale*, and *The Tempest*, contain masques and masque-like features. Professor Thorndike believes that the dance of satyrs in *The Winter's Tale*, IV, iv, 352, was borrowed from Jonson's *Masque of Oberon*, presented January 1, 1611.[2] In *The Tempest* Shakespeare wrote what may fairly be called a masque-drama, making use in a really organic and expressive way of spectacular elements suggested by the fashion of the day. At one and the same time, he followed the fashion, filled his pockets, satisfied his artist soul, and left to after-time a "great legacy of thought."

It will be well to reproduce from the First Folio a few of the most striking stage-directions of these last plays. After Posthumus falls asleep at line 29 of *Cymbeline*, V, iv, we learn from the direction that the ghosts of his father, his mother, and his brothers enter to *Solemne Musicke*, and circle around him as he lies sleeping. At l. 92 we have the direction: *Iupiter descends in Thunder and Lightning, sitting upon an Eagle: he throwes a Thunderbolt. The Ghostes fall on their knees.*

At l. 113 Jupiter *Ascends;* and at l. 122 the ghosts *Vanish.*

The Tempest begins with *A tempestuous noise of Thunder and Lightning heard.* The elaborate directions of our modern editions

[1] Ll. 68–91. [2] *Publications Modern Language Association*, XV (N. S. VIII, 1900), 116.

for III, iii, are copied almost exactly from the Folio. That at l. 52 reads: *Thunder and Lightning. Enter Ariell (like a Harpey) claps his wings upon the Table, and with a quient device the Banquet vanishes.*

When Prospero suddenly puts an end to the masque of goddesses at l. 138 of IV, i, the Folio tells us:

Enter certaine Reapers (properly habited:) they ioyne with the Nimphes, in a gracefull dance, towards the end whereof, Prospero *starts sodainly and speakes, after which to a strange hollow and confused noyse, they heavily vanish.*

We can be sure that the production of these elaborate stage-effects would lead to increased care in the setting of more realistic scenes. In particular, the scene in the chamber of Imogen, which we have been discussing, was undoubtedly presented with a care and a fulness of detail that would not have been expected a few years earlier.

Scene i of Act II, which precedes this one in Imogen's bedchamber, takes place out of doors, that is upon the uncovered front stage. In it Cloten makes a full display of his clownish, braggart nature; but practically nothing else is accomplished for the play, although the Second Lord soliloquizes concerning the wonder that Cloten's crafty mother "should yield the world this ass," and upon the unhappy situation of the "divine Imogen." I would suggest that this unessential front scene is inserted here in order that the rear stage, which has just served in I, vi, as the room in which Imogen receives Iachimo, may be transformed into her bedchamber, in readiness for II, ii.

But how were the settings of the bedchamber cleared away? Brodmeier believes that in the next scene, II, iii, the musicians play and sing upon the front stage, and that during this time the rear stage, concealed by drawn curtains, is being cleared. With the going away of the musicians and the entry of Cymbeline and the Queen, the curtains are again opened, and the scene gradually transfers itself to the back stage. When Cloten is left alone, he knocks upon the door of the tiring-room, which serves as the door of Imogen's chamber.[1]

[1] Brodmeier, pp. 58, 79.

The varying subject-matter of the scene suits well with this bold conjecture. The gathering of the musicians and the serenade seem to belong in the open air; and the words of the wonderful song—"Hark, hark! the lark at heaven's gate sings"—fairly demand that they be sung under the open sky. Brodmeier says that Cloten and his companions "appear on the front stage as in a 'Vorzimmer' to Imogen's bedchamber"; but the bare front stage would more naturally be accepted by the audience as indicating an outdoor scene. The latter part of II, iii, is located within the palace before the door of Imogen's chamber—especially the private colloquy between Cloten and Imogen's waiting-woman, and Imogen's bitter words to Cloten. This portion would be presented on the rear stage.

The Winter's Tale, V, ii

Students of Shakespeare have been very much puzzled by the fact that the reconciliation of Leontes and Polixenes, and the discovery of the parentage of Perdita, of which we learn in scene ii of Act V of *The Winter's Tale*, are merely reported by certain gentlemen of the court, who have no claim upon our interest, and whose affected language seems at times decidedly inappropriate. We should expect these occurrences to be acted out before us and to enthrall us with their joy and pathos. The description of the statue of Hermione, "newly performed by the rare Italian master, Julio Romano," is, to be sure, a most helpful touch of preparation for the close of the play. After the Shepherd and Clown enter, we have some deliciously naïve comedy. The Clown insists:

> I was a gentleman born before my father; for the king's son took me by the hand, and called me brother; and then the two kings called my father brother; and then the prince my brother and the princess my sister called my father father; and so we wept, and there was the first gentleman-like tears that ever we shed.
>
> *Shepherd.* We may live, son, to shed many more.
>
> *Clown.* Ay; or else 'twere hard luck, being in so preposterous estate as we are.[1]

This touch of humor gives a helpful bit of relief before the intense statue scene. The scene-divisions are taken from the First Folio.

[1] Ll. 150–159.

Why was this scene put into narrative? Would it not have been true in this case that "things seen are mightier than things heard"? Dr. Furness, in his monumental edition of this play, brings together the answers of a number of critics to this question, and then adds an entirely new explanation of his own. I indicate by brief quotations the more important suggestions.

It was, I suppose, only to spare his own labor that the poet put this whole scene into narrative, ... the two kings might have met upon the stage, and, after the examination of the old Shepherd, the young lady might have been recognized in sight of the spectators.[1]

Probably this scene is given in narrative that the paramount interest of the play may rest, as it ought to do, with the restoration of Hermione.[2]

What was Shakespeare's motive for conveying by narrative what he might have made so pathetic in representation? This is the more strange and provoking, inasmuch as narrative is by no means his forte, except when it is combined with action or passion; and those euphuistic gentlemen talk mere epigram and antithesis. . . . . I suspect Shakespeare was hurried in his latter scenes, and could compose this sort of dialogue with the least aid from inspiration.[3]

The poet has wisely placed this recognition of Perdita behind the scenes, otherwise the play would have been too full of powerful scenes. . . . . The mere relation of this meeting is in itself a rare masterpiece of prose description.[4]

It is easy to see that Shakespeare was here in a hurry to conclude; the play would have been complete had that which is here narrated been placed on the stage.[5]

Shakespeare gives merely a description of the reconciliation of Leontes and Polixenes and of the recognition of Perdita, either out of regard to the scheme of the play, which is already long drawn out, or else to avoid weakening the effect of the final scene by having it preceded by one of a similar purport. . . . . It is manifest that the Poet devoted an especial care to this portion of his drama; the antitheses and parallelisms are arranged artistically, the metaphors and the style are harmoniously rounded. We have an amusing offset to the ceremonious and artistic prose of the earlier portion of the scene in the downright prose of the two Clowns with their delicious simplicity over their newly born nobility.[6]

Is it not allowable to suppose that Shakespeare was afraid of his actors? He knew, none so well, how easily deep and tragic emotion may be converted by a single false expression into not merely comedy, but even farce. . . . . Let us vividly picture to ourselves what might be fairly termed the joyous, ebullient antics of Leontes, first begging pardon of Polixenes, then hugging Florizel, then worrying Perdita with his embraces,

[1] Johnson. [2] Harness. [3] Hartley Coleridge. [4] Gervinus. [5] Guizot. [6] Delius.

then wringing the old Shepherd's hand, who was crying vigorously and probably with superfluous noise,—and I think we shall be quite aware that unless all the characters were assumed by actors of commanding power, the scene would degenerate into farce and end amid uproarious jeers.[1]

Hartley Coleridge and Guizot believe that Shakespeare has here lost a great dramatic opportunity; and I had long been inclined to agree with them. I cannot think that the dramatist's hurry or his desire to avoid labor are probable explanations of the difficulty. There may seem to be some force in the suggestion of Harness; but our interest in Perdita hardly rivals or imperils that which Hermione inspires. The mother lives in the daughter, and shares all her glory. The theory of Gervinus that the play was in danger of being "too full of powerful scenes," and that of Delius that it was necessary "to avoid weakening the effect of the final scene by having it preceded by one of a similar purport," deserve due consideration. But would not the ecstatic joy at the recovery of Perdita be in decided contrast with the religious solemnity of that intense moment when Hermione, the statue, flushes into life, and comes back to the world of human love? Though the two scenes are in some ways similar, are they not in many ways contrasted?

The acute suggestion of Dr. Furness, the honored master of us all, is very fascinating. But is there anything for which Shakespeare is unwilling to trust his actors? The first condition and the constant necessity of dramatic writing is that the actors be trusted. And is it probable that the dramatist who had trusted them for *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *King Lear*, and *Macbeth*, and who trusts them here for the great statue scene, mutilated his play at this point because he was afraid of them? I confess that I am "afraid of" this ingenious explanation.

It is a complete anticlimax, after all the wealth of critical sagacity that has been expended upon this scene, to suggest that it owes its present form to the need of an open-air, front scene, during the progress of which the rear stage may be carefully arranged for the crowning statue scene. The reconciliation of the two kings and the discovery of Perdita's identity have taken place in the privacy of the palace, but the news at once flies about the

[1] Furness.

streets. During this scene of narration, the rear stage, which has just served as a room in Leontes' palace, can be transformed into the interior of a chapel in Paulina's house, where, upon a pedestal behind a curtain, stands the waiting statue.

Since Hermione and Perdita appear together only in the closing scene, where Perdita speaks but five lines, a modern star actress sometimes takes both rôles, another person assuming the part of Perdita during this final scene. It is quite conceivable that Shakespeare's company might give both parts to some young man especially gifted in presenting female rôles. The remarkable likeness between mother and daughter which the play demands would thus be assured. The absence of both Hermione and Perdita from V, ii, would facilitate this arrangement. It is possible that this suggestion furnishes a further explanation of the fact that Perdita is not allowed to appear in person in this scene.

If the intense power of the final scene was duly brought out in Shakespeare's own day—and we must suppose that in some good measure it was—great care was necessarily given to the proper arrangement of the rear stage. There is perhaps nothing else so fine in the literature of this play as the comments of Lady Martin (Helen Faucit). She tells us of the religious care which she bestowed upon every detail of this great scene, until at last, as one critic of her acting expresses it, "the solemnized hearts of the spectators were free to beat once more." In Shakespeare's day also, the preparation for that thrilling experience when the statue comes to life and descends from its pedestal would naturally be made with the utmost care. We have seen that the preceding scene has perplexed the critics, and that no two of them agree in explaining its peculiar character. The reason that has been indicated, drawn from practical stage convenience, would explain both the form of the scene and why it is that we have such puzzled and contradictory interpretations from the commentators.

CONCLUSION

I have made no account in this paper of intermissions between the acts. That there were often such intermissions we know. There was either music alone, or both music and dancing, at the end of

each of the first three acts of Beaumont and Fletcher's *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, as is made plain by the comments of the Citizen's Wife. At the beginning of Act III of Middleton's *The Changeling*, the stage-direction reads: "*In the act-time* DE FLORES *hides a naked rapier behind a door.*"[1] There is abundant evidence to show that there were often intermissions between the acts.[2]

Two different writers have recently called attention to evidence which seems to indicate that in the performances at the Globe Theatre there was no music between the acts, and presumably there were no act-intervals.

The Malcontent was first played at Blackfriars in the spring of 1603. During the unsettled state of affairs of that year . . . . it fell into the hands of the Burbage company, who cut out the music elements, in the main, because that company could not present them, as the following from the *Induction* spoken in 1604 from the Globe stage indicates:—

"*Sly.* What are your additions?

Burbage. Sooth, not greatly needful; only as your salad to your great feast, to entertain a little more time, and to abridge the not-received custom of music in our theatre."[3]

Professor Wallace, in his most interesting and valuable work, interprets this passage as showing that "the public theatres had not yet in 1604 adopted the music introductions and interspersions of the private house."[4]

In an article in the *Shakespeare Jahrbuch* of 1908, on "Music in the Elizabethan Theatre," Mr. W. J. Lawrence comments as follows upon the above "curious passage in Webster's induction to the augmented version of *The Malcontent* (as acted by the King's players at the Globe in 1604)":

"To abridge the not receiv'd custom of musick in our theatre," plainly means that the Blackfriars' custom of playing inter-act music had little or no recognition at the Globe. It certainly cannot be taken to indicate that musicians had no employment at the famous Bankside house, where, as at other public theatres, songs, dances, and the rhymed musical monologues and farces known as jigs had to be accompanied. The inference would be that whereas (from, say, 1598 onwards) the private theatres made

[1] The Mermaid *Middleton*, I, 115; and Bullen's *Middleton*, VI, 43.

[2] See Reynolds, II, 610, n.; also W. J. Lawrence, "Music in the Elizabethan Theatre," *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, XLIV, 37–39.

[3] C. W. Wallace, *The Children of the Chapel at Blackfriars*, 1597–1603, p. 116, n. 2.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 10.

a regular feature of inter-act music, the public theatres for the most part avoided it. For this diversity in routine a reason can readily be found. .... Acting at the private theatres was by artificial light, and the higher prices of admission charged there were as much to cover the extra expense of candles or torches as to keep out the rabble. The saving of time was no serious object; acting could be proceeded with leisurely, and inter-act music indulged in. But the twenty years' experience between the building of the Theatre and the Globe had taught the players the necessary limitations. Where performances were given by natural light, and in a climate where clear skies could seldom be reckoned upon even in summer, the tendency would be to eliminate everything extraneous.[1]

It seems probable, therefore, that nearly all of Shakespeare's plays were originally intended to be performed without intermissions between the acts. It is not safe to insist that this is true for all the plays. The following words of Professor Wallace suggest that there may be some exceptions:

Soon after the Burbage company took over the Blackfriars (1608), they began to develop this [the musical] side of their performance on the lines followed by the former Boys there. Certain of the Boys were taken into the Burbage company at this time. Shakespeare's *The Tempest* is probably his first play written for the Blackfriars.[2]

I am well aware that I have not proved the fact of alternation staging in the original presentation of even these few selected portions of Shakespeare's plays. A large amount of hypothesis and uncertainty is at present unavoidable. The probability of my contention I must leave to others.

I have discussed five scenes of Shakespeare which it seems difficult to account for on purely artistic and dramatic grounds. These all come in immediate connection with indoor scenes which call for a somewhat elaborate setting of the stage. I have suggested that these questionable scenes in their actual form are due to the practical difficulties in staging the plays; that in them Shakespeare is occupying the time as best he can while the rear stage is being set, or being cleared away; that he is simply obeying one of the earliest maxims that he penned, and making "a virtue of necessity."

ALBERT H. TOLMAN

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[1] *Jahrbuch*, XLIV, 39, 40.

[2] *The Children of the Chapel at Blackfriars*, 1597–1603, p. 10, and n. 3.

66.

BINDING SECT. APR 18 1980

PB
1
M7
v.6

Modern philology

64

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY